UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
3 1761 00456904 2

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026 with funding from
University of Toronto

https://archive.org/details/lifereignofedwar0000scof_a5b1

THE LIFE AND REIGN OF EDWARD THE FOURTH

E
5A

THE LIFE AND REIGN
OF
EDWARD THE FOURTH

King of England and of France and Lord of Ireland

BY

CORA L. SCOFIELD, Ph.D.

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOLUME I

278327/32
6. 10.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.4
NEW YORK, TORONTO
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA AND MADRAS
1923

DA
258
S36
V.1

Made in Great Britain.

To
My Beloved Companion
MY MOTHER
And to the Cherished Memory of
A Gallant Soldier and an Eager
Collector of Books
MY FATHER
HIRAM SCOFIELD
Brigadier General of Volunteers in
The American Civil War.

FOREWORD

Like all American students who have enjoyed the privilege of working at the Public Record Office, the British Museum, and the London Guildhall, I owe a debt of gratitude for the unfailing kindness and helpfulness shown by all persons with whom I came in contact. This applies not only to the officials who have special charge of England's literary and historical treasures, but to those who, with never tiring patience, hunted out the many books and manuscripts I wanted to consult. To some of these, I am told, this word of acknowledgment comes too late. For such let my thanks be as bright flowers laid upon their soldier graves.

CORA L. SCOFIELD.

Boston, Massachusetts.
January 10*th*, 1923.

CONTENTS

BOOK I—THE ROAD TO THE THRONE

CHAPT. PAGE

I. THE BOYHOOD OF EDWARD AND THE BEGINNINGS OF THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN THE HOUSES OF LANCASTER AND YORK - - - - - 1

II. THE LORDS OF CALAIS - - - 41

III. THE LORDS OF CALAIS INVADE ENGLAND - - 71

IV. YORK'S FAILURE - - - - 101

BOOK II—THE WINNING OF THE CROWN AND THE KINGDOM

I. EDWARD TAKES THE THRONE - - - 127

II. THE BATTLE OF TOWTON AND THE CORONATION - 153

III. GATHERING UP THE REINS OF GOVERNMENT - 186

IV. FOREIGN RELATIONS AND FIRST PARLIAMENT - 207

V. LANCASTRIAN PLOTS AND OTHER ANXIETIES - 230

VI. QUEEN MARGARET'S DISAPPOINTMENT - - 250

VII. THE TREACHERY OF PERCY AND GREY - 268

VIII. THE ST. OMER DIET: QUEEN MARGARET'S SECOND DISAPPOINTMENT - - - - 290

IX. THE OVERTHROW OF SOMERSET, PERCY, AND GREY - 312

BOOK III—THE STRUGGLE WITH WARWICK

I. THE MARRIAGE ANNOUNCEMENT - - 343

II. THE CORONATION OF ELIZABETH WOODVILLE AND THE CAPTURE OF HENRY VI - - - 364

III. BURGUNDY OR FRANCE? - - - 393

IV. GATHERING CLOUDS - - - - 421

CHAPT. PAGE

V. THE MARRIAGE OF MARGARET OF YORK AND CHARLES THE BOLD - - - - 440

VI. WARWICK'S FIRST FAILURE - - - 470

VII. WARWICK'S SECOND FAILURE - - - 509

VIII. WARWICK'S TRIUMPH: THE READEPTION OF HENRY VI 537

IX. EDWARD'S TRIUMPH: THE BATTLES OF BARNET AND TEWKESBURY - - - - 566

ERRATA

Vol. I, p. 336, line 28. *For* Sir Ralph Percy *read* Sir Ralph Grey.

,, p. 371, line 19. *For* Empress of Germany *read* wife of Frederick III.

,, p. 506, note 3. *For* Bastard of Burgundy *read* Bastard of Brittany.

,, p. 512, line 6. *For* Sir Ralph Percy *read* Sir Henry Percy.

BOOK I

THE ROAD TO THE THRONE

CHAPTER I

THE BOYHOOD OF EDWARD AND THE BEGINNINGS OF THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN THE HOUSES OF LANCASTER AND YORK

EDWARD, second son and third child of Richard Plantagenet, Duke of York, and Cecily Neville, his wife, was born at Rouen, in Normandy, on 28th April, 1442, at forty-four minutes after two o'clock in the morning, and according to a note left by the antiquarian, John Stow, the christening took place in the cathedral of Rouen.[1] The latest biographer of Edward IV, however, having ascertained that there is no record of the christening in the chapter book of the cathedral, is of the opinion that Stow was mistaken and that Edward was baptized, not in the cathedral, but in the chapel of the castle.[2] However that may be, those who stood as sponsors for the child at the font were Thomas, Lord Scales, and Elizabeth, Lady Say, sister of Lord Sudeley and wife, at that time, of Sir John Montgomery,[3] and the subsequent history of these godparents is typical of the time. For Lord Scales, preserving to the end his loyalty to the house of Lancaster, met with a tragic death in the bloody struggle which ended in the accession of his godson to the English throne, while Lady Say gave her allegiance to the house of York and in consequence enjoyed her godson's favour till her dying day. To the act of parliament which recognized his title to the throne Edward took pains to append a clause safeguarding his godmother's right to the manor of Cheshunt, in Hertfordshire, and a few years later, in February, 1464, we find him sending an order to the chief butler of his realm that "of our gift ye deliver incontinent upon the sight hereof a butt of tyre unto our right dear and entirely beloved godmother, Dame Elizabeth, Lady Say."[1] This gift of wine may have been prompted by news of Lady Say's failing health, as she died within the year.[2] The name of her son, Sir Thomas Montgomery, will appear frequently in the following pages, as he was employed by Edward on many a mission to foreign courts.

---

[1] Worcester, Annales, 763; Harleian MS. 543, f. 130. See also a note in Cotton MS. Domitian A IX, f. 83b, where it is stated that Edward's birth occurred on 27th April at fourteen hours and forty-four minutes after midday —i.e., at 2-44 a.m. on 28th April—and some genealogical notes printed in Thomas Hearne's edition of Worcester's Annales, according to which it took place at 2-45 a.m. Worcester makes a mistake in the day of the week, giving it as Monday instead of Saturday (Gairdner, Richard III, 4), and Stow gives the day of birth as 27th April, an error readily accounted for by the custom of numbering the hours of the day from midday to midday.

[2] Stratford, Edward the Fourth, 11-12. The evidence is of too negative a character to be of much value.

[3] Worcester, 773. On Lady Say, see Letters of Margaret of Anjou, 105, and Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 20, 459.

The nurse of the future Edward IV was a French woman from the *Pays de Caux* whose name was Anne. In the year 1474 Anne of Caux received from her former nursling a pension of twenty pounds a year, a generous sum in those days, and this grant was afterwards renewed by Richard III, whose baby footsteps as well as Edward's she had probably guided.[3]

In the course of time Edward of York was to be blessed with many brothers and sisters, although several of them left the world almost as soon as they entered it. At the time Edward joined the family, Anne, the eldest child of the Duke and Duchess of York, who had been born at the duke's manor of Fotheringay on 10th August, 1439, was nearing the completion of the third year of her life, and, baby though she was, was probably already affianced to Henry Holland, Duke of Exeter; but the second child of the duke and duchess, Henry, born at Hatfield on 10th February, 1441, died in infancy, perhaps before Edward was born.[4] After Edward followed Edmund, known to history as the Earl of Rutland, and Elizabeth, afterwards Duchess of Suffolk, both of whom, like Edward, first saw the light at Rouen, the one on 17th May, 1443, the other on 22nd April, 1444,[5] while the next child, Margaret, who, as Duchess of Burgundy, will figure prominently in our story, was born, like her sister Anne, at Fotheringay, her birthday being

---

[1] Rolls of Parl., V, 471; Exchequer Accounts, Butlerage, bundle 82, no. 10.

[2] Letters of Margaret of Anjou, *ut sup.*

[3] Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 439; III, 411.

[4] Worcester, 763.

[5] Worcester again makes a mistake in the day of the week when recording the Earl of Rutland's birth, and Dr. Gairdner has suggested that the correct date may be 27th May. But 17th May is the date given in Hearne's genealogical notes, as well as by Worcester. According to Hearne's notes, Elizabeth was born on 22nd December, but Worcester's date, 22nd April, is more likely to be right.

3rd May, 1446. Then came four more sons, William and John, born in 1447 and 1448, who died while still young, George—" false, fleeting, perjured Clarence "—who began his ill-starred career at Dublin Castle on 21st October, 1449, Thomas, who was born a year or two after Clarence and to whom death came almost as soon as life, and Richard, who was to become in the course of time King Richard III and who first opened his eyes on this sinful world at Fotheringay on 2nd October, 1452. Finally, on 20th July, 1455, the Duchess Cecily presented her lord with a fourth daughter, Ursula, the place of whose birth is unknown.[1]

As the eldest living son of the Duke of York, the little boy born at Rouen in 1442 was the heir not only to vast estates, situated for the most part in the border land between England and Wales, but to a better hereditary title to the crown of England than that which the ruling sovereign himself could show. During the century which had elapsed since Edward III first laid claim to the crown of France, English armies had won great victories on French battlefields and the house of Valois had been robbed of a large part of its possessions, and yet in some ways England had suffered even more than France during the many years of war between the two kingdoms. For one thing, while at the close of the war the house of Valois still ruled over France, despite the fact that one king of that house had ended his days in captivity in London, in England a revolution had brought about the deposition and death of Edward III's grandson and lawful heir only two decades after the great Edward's death. At the time of the birth of the child who was to become the fourth Edward of England, the house of Lancaster had been in possession of the English throne for more than forty years, although the only hereditary claim to the crown which the first Lancastrian king had been able to adduce was so weak that he had felt the need of strengthening it artificially.

Richard II, the only son of the Black Prince, Edward III's oldest son, was not blest with any children, and as Edward's second son had died without heirs, Richard recognized as heir apparent to the throne Roger Mortimer, Earl of March, the son of the daughter of Lionel, Duke of Clarence, Edward's third son. Unfortunately

---

[1] Worcester, 764, 765, 771; Sandford, Genealogical Hist. of the Kings and Queens of England. Worcester, who records the births of the other children of the Duke of York with painstaking minuteness, does not mention Thomas, a fact from which it would be safe to conclude that the life of this son was very brief even if some contemporary verses did not furnish further proof thereof. See Gairdner, Richard III, 5.

Roger Mortimer was killed in Ireland in 1398, but he left two sons, and to the older of them, Edmund Mortimer, a child of six years, his rights descended. In little Edmund Mortimer's claim to the succession only one weak point could be found: the blood of Edward III had been transmitted to him through a woman. But the so-called Salic law had never been formally recognized in England, and as Edward III had advanced his claim to the crown of France in direct defiance of it, there can be little doubt that, if Edmund Mortimer had been a grown man instead of a child in the closing years of the fourteenth century, his rights would have been acknowledged and maintained. And had Mortimer succeeded to the throne, England would probably have been spared many years of bloody and exhausting civil war. Fate decreed otherwise, however, and Henry of Bolingbroke, Duke of Lancaster, son of John of Gaunt, the fourth son of Edward III by his first wife, Blanche of Lancaster, rose in rebellion, wrested from Richard II the royal authority which he had abused, and, ignoring the rights of Edmund Mortimer, made himself king.

Henry of Lancaster's real claim to the throne of England was one in which the right of conquest was curiously mingled with the ancient right, revived for the occasion, of the wise men of England to choose their king. But the claim which he endeavoured to force into the foreground was of a totally different nature. Since as a descendant of Edward III he could produce no claims which were not better represented by Edmund Mortimer, it was as the descendant of Henry III, not of Edward III, that he came before parliament after he had forced Richard II to sign his abdication in the Tower. Whether the duke really meant to allude to the tradition that Edward I was the second son of Henry III, instead of the eldest, and that by right the crown ought to have passed to Edward's brother, Edmund Crouchback, from whom Lancaster could claim descent through his mother, Blanche of Lancaster, is a question; but certain it is that only the acceptance of that fanciful tale could give him an hereditary title to the throne which was superior to that of Roger Mortimer. In spite of all flaws in his claim, however, Henry of Lancaster became king of England with the sanction of parliament, while Edmund Mortimer spent his life in comparative obscurity, except when he was made the figure-head of some anti-Lancastrian conspiracy. Mortimer died in 1425 and left no children, but his sister Anne married Richard, Earl of Cambridge, a man in whose veins also flowed the blood of Edward III, as he was the son of Edmund Langley, Duke of York, Edward's fifth son. This Earl of Cambridge was beheaded by Henry V when it was discovered that he was scheming to set his brother-in-law on Henry's throne, but all the claims of the house of Mortimer passed to the son of Anne Mortimer and the Earl of Cambridge, and that son was Richard, Duke of York.

From his mother as well as from his father Edward of York received a precious inheritance. To her he owed not simply an extraordinary personal beauty which served him more than one good turn during the course of his life, but that kinship with the Nevilles, the richest and most powerful family in England, which more than anything else helped the house of York, when the time was ripe, to make good its claim to the throne.

Cecily Neville, Duchess of York, was the youngest daughter of Ralph, first Earl of Westmoreland, and his second wife, Joan Beaufort, daughter of John of Gaunt and Katharine Swynford and granddaughter of Edward III; and as Earl Ralph had many sons and daughters, and as those sons and daughters made fortunate marriages, the Duchess of York rejoiced in many kindred of the highest rank and the greatest wealth and influence. By his first marriage the Earl of Westmoreland had two sons and seven daughters. The oldest son died during his father's lifetime, but this son's son, Ralph II, to whom the earldom of Westmoreland afterwards passed, lived long enough not only to see his cousin Edward ascend the throne, but to see him borne to the grave, while of the earl's seven daughters, one married Thomas, Lord Dacre of Gillesland, of whose son, Ralph, Lord Dacre of Gillesland, and son-in-law, Richard, Lord Dacre of the South, we shall hear something, and another married Richard, Lord Scrope of Bolton, whose grandson, John, Lord Scrope of Bolton, will also become known to us. By his second marriage Cecily's father had no less than thirteen children, eight sons and five daughters. Cecily's oldest brother, Richard, married Alice Montagu, daughter of Thomas, Earl of Salisbury, and through his wife's right became Earl of Salisbury. William, Cecily's second brother, married the daughter and heiress of Sir Thomas Fauconberg and became Lord Fauconberg; for her third brother, George, her father purchased the barony of Latimer from his half-brother;[1] her fourth brother,

---

[1] As Lord Latimer was adjudged an idiot about the time of Edward's acces-

Edward, married the daughter and heiress of Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Worcester, and through his wife's right became Lord Abergavenny; and her fifth brother, Robert, entered the Church and secured the great palatine bishopric of Durham.[1] Of Cecily's sisters, one, named Katharine, married John Mowbray, Duke of Norfolk, and became the mother of John Mowbray II, Duke of Norfolk.[2] Another, Eleanor, married the chief magnate of the north of England, Henry Percy II, Earl of Northumberland, and a third, Anne, married Humphrey Stafford, Duke of Buckingham. Finally, to this long list of Cecily Neville's noble kinsmen and kinswomen must be added the most important name of all, that of her nephew, Richard, son of the Earl of Salisbury, who married Anne Beauchamp and in time became, thanks to her, Earl of Warwick and possessor of the great Beauchamp estates, one of the most splendid inheritances in all England.

Not all these kinsfolk of the Duchess Cecily stood by her husband and son when the flag of rebellion was unfurled, for the second Earl of Westmoreland was a Lancastrian at heart to the end of his days and the Duke of Buckingham, the Earl of Northumberland, and Ralph, Lord Dacre of Gillesland, all gave their lives for Henry VI. But a sufficient number of them supported the pretensions of the house of York to tip the balance in its favour, and one of them, the Earl of Warwick, played so large a part in the dynastic upheavals of his day that he is familiarly known as the Kingmaker.

That Edward of York was born in Normandy instead of in England was due to the fact that at the time of his birth his father was serving, for the second time, as the lieutenant-general of Henry VI in France.[3] The Duke of York was first appointed to

---

sion to the throne (see Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 71), little is heard of him.

[1] Robert Neville died in 1457 and was succeeded in the bishopric of Durham by Lawrence Booth.

[2] Katharine Neville married no less than four times. Her second husband was Thomas Strangways, Esq., her third John, Viscount Beaumont, who was killed in the battle of Northampton, and her fourth Sir John Woodville, brother of Edward IV's queen.

[3] When the Duke of Gloucester set out to steal the crown from Edward's son, he seems to have turned to good account the fact that Edward was born outside of England; for the act of parliament which settled the crown upon Richard III, declaring him to be the only living person who could claim the crown by right of inheritance, laid emphasis on the fact that he was born " within this land, by reason whereof, as we deem in our minds, ye be more naturally inclined to the prosperity and common weal of the same, and all the three Estates of the land have, and may have, more certain

the lieutenancy in France in February, 1436, a few months after the death of the king's uncle, the great Duke of Bedford, and the signing of the treaty of Arras, which brought about the healing of the long feud between the Burgundian and Armagnac factions in France and deprived England of her alliance with Burgundy, the cornerstone of her fortunes in France. From the moment that Philip the Good of Burgundy was transformed from a friend into a foe, English rule in France was doomed, and even before the Duke of York, then a young man of twenty-five, could reach the scene of his new duties, the banner of Charles VII was planted on the walls of Paris. It was not strange, therefore, that the duke soon grew weary of his task and that before long he returned to England, where he was at once drawn into the conflict going on between two opposing parties. One of these parties wanted the war in France pressed at all costs and was headed by his chief, the popular and cultured but hot-headed and unstable Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, the king's uncle, who, during the early years of Henry's minority, had exercised much the same authority in England that the Duke of Bedford had enjoyed in France The other one, built up by the wealthy and powerful Cardinal Beaufort, the king's great-uncle, in opposition to Gloucester, favoured making peace with France while good terms could be obtained.[1] As York had apparently failed in France, the command of the king's armies beyond sea was taken from him and given, after a short interval, to Cardinal Beaufort's nephew, John Beaufort, Earl of Somerset. But though Somerset was energetic and fairly successful in France, in 1440 he was recalled, evidently to appease the Duke of Gloucester, and the Duke of York was again named lieutenant-general. York returned to France, consequently, in May, 1441,[2] and a year later his son Edward was born at Rouen.

Edward came into the world at an unhappy moment in his father's career, and he was only a year old when something occurred

knowledge of your birth and filiation." Rolls of Parliament, VI, 241. Evidently what the authors of the act of settlement meant to imply was that it was possible to be more certain of the legitimacy of the birth of Richard, who was born in England, than of the legitimacy of the birth of Edward, who was not born in England. Is this not a corroboration, heretofore overlooked, of the story that Richard sacrificed his own mother's reputation in order to secure the crown?

[1] For a clear account of the political parties in England at this time, see R. B. Mowat's The Wars of the Roses, 1377-1471 (London, 1914).

[2] Worcester, 763.

which was to prove the source, in a remote way, of all the triumphs as well as catastrophes of his life.

If York's first term of office in France had been unfortunate, his second one was still more so, and this time he was probably more or less to blame for his failure. For while he could justly say that parliament, though always talking loudly in favour of the war in France, had not provided him with sufficient funds, he appears to have been less diligent in the performance of his task than the state of affairs required. The French gained headway both in the north and in the south, and at last it became clear that, unless some change were made, everything would be lost. But it was exceedingly unfortunate that King Henry's advisers again chose to send over from England York's rival, Somerset, who was elevated to the rank of duke and intrusted with a relief force for Guienne. Garter King-of-Arms, to whom was given the unpleasant errand of informing York of Somerset's appointment, was instructed to sugar-coat the pill with conciliatory phrases, but the slur was too obvious not to give offence.[1]

The responsibility for this insult, as it was considered, to the Duke of York lay with the Beaufort party, which, since the recent public disgrace of the Duke of Gloucester's wife, the famous Eleanor Cobham, had been enjoying complete supremacy in England, and the fruit of it was a mortal combat between York and the Beauforts which ultimately led York to press his claim to the throne and plunged England into all the miseries of civil war. To add to the pity of the whole thing, Somerset's expedition to France proved a total failure. He accomplished nothing whatever, and in the spring of 1444 he died, leaving an infant daughter, Margaret Beaufort, who was one day to be Countess of Richmond and mother of England's first Tudor king. For a time after Somerset's death York stayed on, wrathful though undisturbed, in France, but he was soon to cross swords with a still more deadly enemy, a woman and a queen, and, as if he already had some premonition of what was before him, he set out to strengthen his hand by means of a foreign marriage alliance.

About the time of Somerset's death a truce was signed between England and France. At the same time Henry VI, who had already begun to show signs of a physical, if not of a mental, weakness which rendered him wholly unfit to rule a kingdom, was betrothed to

---

[1] Privy Council Proceedings, V, 259-263.

Margaret, the sixteen year old daughter of the poet and friend of poets, René of Anjou, Duke of Lorraine and titular king of Sicily and Jerusalem; and in the autumn of 1444 William de la Pole, Duke of Suffolk, now the head of the Beaufort party, went over to Nancy to fetch the king's bride. Some difficulties arose, however, and it was not until the following spring—and then only after promising the surrender, nominally to René of Anjou but in reality to Charles VII, of all of England's claims in Maine and Anjou—that Suffolk was able to bring Margaret of Anjou to England.

It was inevitable that a marriage for the king which had been purchased at so great a price should excite the opposition of the Duke of Gloucester and his friend, the Duke of York. But neither York nor Gloucester betrayed his true feelings immediately, and perhaps Suffolk hoped for a moment that he had bought off at least one of his opponents by consenting to act as York's emissary in some negotiations which, in his heart, he was probably by no means anxious to help on. For while Suffolk was seeking a bride for King Henry, York had been looking about for a suitable mate for his son Edward, who had now attained to the advanced age of two years, and when, in spite of the fact that he belonged to the party which stood for war with France, the duke's choice fell on a princess of the house of Valois, it was Suffolk who, while at Nancy, and apparently at York's request, approached the king of France on the subject. Charles VII proved to be rather surprisingly willing to listen to a marriage proposal from York, and he not only sent a gracious message to the duke by Suffolk, but on 19th February, 1445, wrote to him from Nancy, expressing pleasure at the prospect of the marriage for which the duke asked. At the moment Charles's letter reached him, York was so much occupied in showing the proper attentions to Margaret of Anjou, who was just then passing through Normandy on her way to England, that he had no time to think of his own affairs. But in April, with apologies for his delay, he sent Sir Richard Merbury and John Ernoys to the French king to talk over the marriage project more fully and to announce his intention to send a more formal embassy in May;[1] and these envoys brought back a second letter from Charles in which the king expressed his readiness to agree to a marriage between his daughter Madeleine and York's son.

---

[1] See a letter from the duke to Charles which is dated Rouen, 18th April. Stevenson, Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Wars of the English in France, I, 79-82.

York's formal embassy, which did not actually set out until June, consisted of the Bishop of Bayeux, Merbury and Ernoys, Doctor Thomas Basin, the future historian of the reign of Charles VII, John Clay, treasurer of the duke's household, and John du Drosay, his secretary; and by the hands of these men the duke dispatched a letter to Charles in which he said that he was "parfaictement esjoy et console" by the king's willingness to consent to the marriage he desired. At the same time, however, he raised objections to Madeleine on account of her "très tendre âge" (she was a year and a half younger than Edward!) and, explaining that he was anxious that his oldest son should have offspring as early as possible, expressed a preference for her sister, Jeanne, whose years numbered about thirteen.[1] But Charles would not agree to the substitution of Jeanne for Madeleine, and York was not long in making up his mind to accept the younger princess if he could not get the older one. In the latter part of September he wrote another letter, this time joyfully accepting the offer of Madeleine's hand for his son and telling Charles that he would send more envoys to him to arrange the marriage after he had consulted King Henry.[2] Finally, when some French ambassadors came over to England in December to push on the negotiations for the surrender of Maine, they brought authority to treat with York regarding the marriage, and the duke wrote to Charles shortly after expressing the hope that the negotiations would be brought to a happy issue, apologizing for his delay in sending an embassy, and promising to send one as soon as possible.[3] This letter the duke intrusted to Lord Dudley and John Ernoys, and they were to complete the negotiations for the marriage between Edward of York, upon whom the title of Earl of March had recently been conferred, and Madeleine of France.[4] Nevertheless, this is the last that is heard of the proposed marriage.[1] As such a marriage would have brought York into closer relationship with the royal house of France than that which Henry VI himself had just secured by making Margaret of Anjou his wife, probably Henry's proud bride, if not Henry himself, frowned upon it and the royal consent was withheld.

---

[1] See another letter from the duke dated Rouen, 10th June, *ibid.*, I., 83-86, and also "Pièces concernant Thomas Basin," Basin, Hist. des Règnes de Charles VII et de Louis XI, IV, 151-152. Madeleine of France was born on 1st December, 1443, Jeanne about the year 1430. Vallet de Viriville, Hist de Charles VII, III, 55.

[2] Stevenson, Letters and Papers, I, 160-163.

[3] *Ibid*, 168-170. This letter is dated London, 21st December.

[4] See the letter of credence with which the duke supplied his ambassadors. Hist. MSS. Commission, Report 9, appendix, part II, p. 410. The editor gives the date of this letter as 22nd December, 1456, but it must belong properly to the year 1445.

The exact date at which the title of Earl of March was first conferred on Edward is not known, but in this letter his father alludes to him as the "Conte de la Marche."

During the time York was thus treating with Charles VII for the hand of Princess Madeleine, the term for which he had been appointed lieutenant-general in France expired; and when he returned to England in the autumn of 1445 to attend parliament, he seems to have remained there. His duchess and her children either came home with him or soon followed him to England, and from this time on the two little sons who had been born at Rouen seem to have lived in the duke's Welsh border castle of Ludlow. There Edward and Edmund grew from babyhood into boyhood and were cared for not only by the faithful Anne of Caux, but by a tutor, not altogether acceptable in their sight, one Richard Crofte of Crofte, a gentleman of the neighbouring county of Hereford.[2]

Very gladly would York have accepted the lieutenancy in France again, and much better would it have been in the long run for all concerned if his wish had been gratified. But Somerset's brother, the Marquis of Dorset, also coveted the post, and he found more support at court than York. The rivalry between the two candidates lasted two years, the lieutenancy remaining vacant in the meantime, and then, while York was at home nursing his disappointment, a storm broke which swept away Humphrey of Gloucester, his leader and the heir presumptive to the throne, and probably put into his mind a thought which never would have entered it had Gloucester continued to live.[3]

Many misfortunes flowed from the marriage of Henry VI and Margaret of Anjou. The only dowry the queen brought to her husband was her beauty and her dangerously high spirit, and Suffolk's surrender of England's rights in Maine and Anjou in order to secure a marriage of so little benefit to England gave the enemies of the Beauforts an excellent excuse for taking up the cudgels against them. The Duke of Gloucester had met Margaret with an imposing retinue upon her arrival in London, but this apparently cordial welcome did not hide his true feelings about the marriage. It was well understood that he would do all in his power to prevent the fulfilment of the promise to surrender Maine to France, and, because of this, Margaret immediately joined forces with Suffolk against him. Parliament was summoned to meet at Bury St. Edmunds in February, 1447, and the intention was to obtain the impeachment of Gloucester. The duke was arrested, in fact, as soon as he reached Bury, but a few days later, before there had been time for impeachment proceedings, he died in a manner too sudden and too convenient for his enemies not to arouse suspicion of false play on their part. There were many men in England who believed, though probably quite unjustly,[1] that Suffolk, if not Queen Margaret herself, had been guilty of murder, and the dead duke, although in his lifetime he had been anything but a saint, came to be regarded by his friends and adherents as a holy martyr to the cause of good government and military glory.

---

[1] Twelve years later Madeleine was betrothed to Ladislaus Posthumous, king of Hungary and Bohemia, but he succumbed to poison just as she was leaving France to meet him. Chronique de Mathieu d'Escouchy, II, 335. Ultimately she married Gaston de Foix, son of Gaston IV, Count of Foix.

[2] Retrospective Review, Series II, Vol. I, 472-473; Cal. Patent Rolls, Henry VI, 1452-1461, p. 539.

[3] Cf. Vickers, Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, 316.

With the reins of government in the hands of Margaret of Anjou and the Duke of Suffolk, there was little hope that the coveted post in France would be given to York again. And yet, as Charles VII's impatient pressing for the surrender of Maine now threatened to bring on a renewal of the war between England and France, it was highly desirable, indeed essential, that someone should be appointed lieutenant-general. Consequently York continued his efforts to secure the prize, and for a moment, seemingly, he actually won it.[2] But in the end it was a very different office that was assigned to him. On 30th July he was named lieutenant of Ireland for ten years, and soon after the Marquis of Dorset, who meanwhile had become Duke of Somerset, carried off the lieutenancy in France.[3]

York had large personal interests in Ireland, as he had inherited from his mother extensive estates in the western part of the island, including the earldom of Ulster and the lordships of Connaught, Meath, Leix, and Ossory.[4] Nevertheless, he and his friends looked upon his appointment to so distant and comparatively obscure a post as the lieutenancy of Ireland as nothing less than banishment, and he showed that he was in no haste to take up his new duties. He lingered at home so long that it was not until July, 1449, that he landed in Ireland.[1] Once there, however, he did his best to win the good-will of the native Irish and also to compose the quarrels which divided and weakened the English settlers, and in both he succeeded so well that all hearts warmed towards him. When his son George was born in Dublin Castle, two such bitter foes as the Earl of Desmond, head of the Geraldines, and the Earl of Ormond, head of the Butlers, consented to forget their differences long enough to share the honour of standing as sponsors for the child.[2] Peace was the rarest of blessings in Ireland, and honest efforts to establish it did not go unappreciated. The many friends York made for himself in Ireland were to stand him in very good stead in the days to come.

---

[1] See a defence of Suffolk by Mr. C. L. Kingsford in his review of Oman's Hist. of Eng., Eng. Hist. Review, July, 1907.

[2] Registrum Abbatiæ Johannis Whethamstede, I., 160. Basin says (I, 192) that the duke's appointment was proclaimed at Rouen.

[3] Privy Council Proceedings, VI, 89-90; Ramsay, Lancaster and York, II, 82-83.

[4] Gilbert, Viceroys of Ireland, 352. These possessions were of little value to the duke, however, as the larger part of them were in the hands of the Irish.

York had scarcely reached Ireland when, although those who had advocated making peace with France now controlled the government, war was again declared between England and France. With this began the last disastrous campaigns of the Hundred Years' War. In October, 1449, Charles VII entered Rouen in triumph, and although reinforcements were sent over from England, the English army met with a crushing defeat at Formigny in the following April. Caen capitulated two months later, and before the autumn of 1450 England had lost the whole of the duchy of Normandy. And while the defeat of Formigny sealed the fate of English rule in Normandy, the misfortunes preceding it had already sealed the fate of the Duke of Suffolk. The duke was impeached, and when he was sent into exile by the king, who hoped to shield him in that way from greater harm, his enemies murdered him at sea. Then occurred almost at once Jack Cade's rebellion. Kent, which suffered from chronic restlessness at this period, rose in open revolt and the adjoining counties followed its lead. Cade, who, as a matter of fact, was an Irishman, claimed to be a cousin of the Duke of York and, assuming the name of John Mortimer, declared that in his veins flowed the blood of the Mortimer who ought to have been king of England. He and his followers also tried to pose as social and political reformers, and among the demands they made were the punishment of those who had been responsible for the death of Humphrey of Gloucester, the dismissal and punishment of all persons who had been associated with Suffolk, and, most significant of all, the recall of the Duke of York to the king's council board. But unluckily the would-be reformers indulged in many excesses. The Londoners, in consequence, turned on them in terror and wrath, and Cade and his rebellion came to an abrupt and violent end.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, 353.

[2] Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters, IV, 965; Gilbert, Viceroys of Ireland, 352-354; D'Alton, Hist. of Ireland, I, 343-344.

In spite of its disgraceful termination, Cade's rebellion had sounded the knell of the house of Lancaster. For the insurgents had voiced the conviction of many people that the Duke of York was the only person who could save the country from disaster, while Cade's use of the name of Mortimer had been a pointed reminder of York's right to even more than the place at the royal council board which had been demanded for him. Nor was it long before there were indications that York himself was thinking dangerous thoughts. Cade's rebellion commenced in Pentecost week and came to an end during the first week of July, and when, late in August or early in September, York suddenly appeared in England and the Duke of Somerset came hurrying home from France, it took no very keen eye to see that there was trouble ahead. Indeed, the gravity of the situation was so evident that a great effort was made to arrest York before he could reach London. But though William Tresham, Speaker of the House of Commons in the last parliament, was murdered as he was going to meet the duke, the duke himself succeeded in avoiding all the traps set for him, and, protected by the Duke of Norfolk and a large body of armed men, marched defiantly to Westminster. York's enemies afterwards asserted that, at his coming to Westminster, he "beat down the spears and walls" in the king's chamber, "by the which might be understood his disposition"; but if the duke was guilty of some unseemly behaviour, he also presented a petition to the king in which de declared to Henry that he was not a traitor, as his enemies had said in his absence, but a true liegeman of his sovereign who had been very badly treated.[2]

Henry replied to York's petition with the gentleness always so characteristic of him, but it was obvious that the duke was suspected of complicity in Cade's rebellion. And it might well be asked why

[1] Stow's Annales, 384-390; Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles, 94-99.

[2] Worcester, 769; Gregory's Chronicle, 195; Rolls of Parl., V, 211-213, 346; Paston Letters, I, 80-82

York had come back to England so suddenly. Had he come simply to demand his proper place in the king's council? Or did he mean to insist upon the recognition of himself as the heir to Henry's throne? As yet Henry and Margaret had no children, and if they continued to be childless, the crown must pass either to Margaret Beaufort, daughter of the late Duke of Somerset and great-granddaughter of John of Gaunt and Katharine Swynford, or else to the Duke of York, the representative of the Mortimers, that older line of descendants from Edward III which had been set aside by Henry IV. But Henry IV himself had taken steps to exclude the descendants of Katharine Swynford, first the mistress and afterwards the wife of John of Gaunt, from the succession,[1] and who, remembering that fact, could deny York's superior right?

Whatever plan York may have had in mind when he left Ireland, he soon saw that he could not carry it out. Popular as he was with the common people, and also with many of the nobility, Cade's rebellion had seriously injured his cause, and it was Somerset, not he, who was to succeed to Suffolk's place. Parliament met, and there were high words and even acts of violence. The Commons strove in vain to obtain the removal of Somerset and other court favourites, and at last, when Thomas Younge of Bristol ventured to ask that York should be recognized as heir to the throne, parliament was prorogued and Younge was sent to the Tower for his pains.[2] So the question of the succession remained unanswered, though the inference was that a Beaufort rather than a representative of the Mortimers would be Henry's choice, if he were forced to make one.

Realizing that Somerset had won again, York retired to his estates on the Welsh border. But in the meantime events in France were advancing his cause by bringing further disgrace upon his opponents. In June, 1451, the French took Bordeaux, and soon after the whole of Guienne passed into their hands. York now began to think that Somerset was about to come to grief on the same rock which had proved fatal to Suffolk, and when no response was made to a manifesto which he issued on 9th January, 1452, and in which he offered to swear allegiance to Henry,[3] he prepared to strike. He assembled his adherents and, on 3rd February, drew up another manifesto which, taken altogether, amounted to a declaration of war—not against King Henry, but against the king's chief minister, whom the duke accused of working continually for his destruction and at whose door he laid the blame for all the recent disasters in France. At the same time, however, that he announced his intention to proceed against the guilty Somerset, York was careful to assure those whom he addressed that he would keep " within the bounds of my liegeance, as it pertaineth to my duty."[1]

---

[1] Excerpta Historica, 153.

[2] Worcester, 769-770; Nicolas's London Chronicle, 137. Cf. Ramsay, II, 138-139.

[3] Paston Letters, I, 96.

Shortly after thus making known his purpose, York, supported by the Earl of Devonshire and Lord Cobham, made his way into Kent, while his adherents in other sections of the kingdom began to make demonstrations in his behalf.[2] But again the duke was doomed to disappointment. At heart the Kentishmen were in sympathy with him, but they had been punished severely for Cade's rebellion, and they were so reluctant to do anything which might get them into further trouble that, when King Henry arrived from London with an army at his back, the duke found it wise to open negotiations with him. The Earls of Warwick and Salisbury, the duke's own kinsmen, were among those who acted as Henry's spokesmen, and, on being promised a pardon for himself and his men and that Somerset should be imprisoned until he had answered the charges against him, the duke surrendered. But what was the royal promise worth? Somerset, instead of being put under arrest, continued to bask in the king's favour, while York himself was carried off to London practically as a captive. Probably the only thing which saved the duke from the Tower was a report that his son, the Earl of March, was bringing a large army from Wales and the Marches to his assistance.[3] The Earl of March was less than ten years old, but in those stirring times the sons of the great were trained for war even in the nursery, where they strutted in tiny coats of armour and brandished tiny swords,[4] and there was nothing incredible in the story that an army was marching towards London under the nominal leadership of a child. The rumour that Edward was coming to his father's rescue seems to have been unfounded, but it was probably for fear of bloodshed that York was finally let off with no other penalty than the taking of a solemn oath of allegiance to the king at St. Paul's in the presence of a great assembly of men of high degree, lay and ecclesiastical.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, I, 97-98; Ellis, Original Letters, Series I, Vol. I, 11-13. Compare with this manifesto the lengthy statement concerning Somerset's crimes and misdemeanors which York drew up probably only a little later. Paston Letters, I, 103-108.

[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 23, 31.

[3] Davies' English Chronicle of the Reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V, and Henry VI, 69-70; Kingsford's Chronicles of London, 163; Whethamstede, I, 162; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 69; Hall's Chronicle, 227.

[4] See Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 247.

The oath which York took on this occasion, carefully written on a small strip of parchment, signed in a bold, firm hand " R. York," and bearing some fragments of the duke's seal, may still be seen among the archives of England, as may also the same oath as taken by his chief confederates, the Earl of Devonshire and Lord Cobham.[1] In this oath the duke acknowledges anew his duty of allegiance to Henry and promises not only to commit no act hostile to the king, but to give warning of, and resist to the utmost, any plot against him which might come to his knowledge. He will come humbly and obediently at the king's command, he swears, whenever he is called, unless he is prevented by sickness or other cause which the king may think reasonable: he will never hereafter assemble the king's people except in his lawful defence as interpreted by his king or his peers: and if wronged or grieved by anyone, he will proceed according to the law, unless again it should be a case of his lawful defence. Lastly, he agrees that if at any time in the future he should attempt, " as with the grace of God I never shall," to do anything " by way of fait or otherwise against your royal estate and the obeissance that I owe thereto, or anything take upon me otherwise than is above expressed," it shall be right for him to be considered from that time forth as " unabled and held and taken as an untrue and openly foresworn man and unabled to all manner of worship, estate, and degree, be it such as I now occupy or any other that might in any wise grow unto me hereafter."[2]

Thus ended the Duke of York's first attempt at rebellion. If his own statement can be relied on, he had desired nothing except to protect himself and to rid England of the Duke of Somerset. But he might too easily have desired more, and so this solemn oath had been wrung from him. Whether any oath would suffice to stay his hand if he saw excuse and opportunity to break it, time alone could tell.

---

[1] Exchequer Miscellanea 8/19, 8/20, 8/21. Another copy of York's oath is preserved in the London Museum, but it lacks his signature and seal.

[2] The duke's oath as printed in the Rolls of Parliament, V, 346, differs somewhat from the original document, mainly in the omission of the clause " and held and taken as an untrue and openly foresworn man." This omission must be due to the carelessness of the transcriber or printer (it probably happened through the recurrence of the word *unabled*), as there can have been no wish on the part of those who drew up the bill of attainder against the Yorkists to weaken the duke's oath by leaving out so important a clause. It should be added that Holinshed, in quoting the oath, includes this clause (see Paston Letters, I, 101-102). But in some minor respects Holinshed's version also is inaccurate.

While England so narrowly escaped war at home, disaster was still pursuing her armies in France. In the autumn of this year the Earl of Shrewsbury, a warrior whose name had once been one to conjure with, succeeded in retaking Bordeaux, but in the following July he was defeated and slain at Castillon, Bordeaux was again lost, and the Hundred Years' War at last came to an end. Great quantities of blood had been spilled, vast sums of money had been spent, and now that the war was over, what had England to show for her much vaunted victories, for her money and her life-blood? Less than she had had in the beginning, since all that was now left to her of her once extensive possessions in France was the town of Calais and about a hundred and twenty square miles of territory adjoining it.[1] Truly, those who were guiding the affairs of England had much to answer for. For while peace with France had come, it had been attained, not by means of an honourable and advantageous treaty such as the Beauforts had once hoped to secure, but by utter defeat.

Although it would be unfair to accuse York of rejoicing in the disastrous outcome of the war in France, he can hardly have escaped feeling some satisfaction at the discomfiture of his opponents and some hope that their misfortunes would turn to his own advantage. And perhaps it points to a belief on the duke's part that his hour of triumph was approaching, and also to his faithfulness to the policy of Humphrey of Gloucester, that immediately after the defeat at Castillon he began to cast about for an ally who might be able to aid him, if he should succeed in gaining control of the government and should wish to renew the war in France. The Duke of Alençon, a prince of the royal blood of France who had been one of the leaders of the revolutionary movement of 1439 known as the Praguerie, had shown willingness, during the later years of the Hundred Years' War, to enter into treasonable relations with the English, and it was to Alençon that York's thoughts now turned. Shortly after the fall of Bordeaux the duke secretly suggested a

[1] Dillon, Calais and the Pale, Archæologia, LIII, 289.

marriage between his son Edward and Alençon's daughter, and at the same time, apparently, invited Alençon to assist him whenever he should find a chance to lead or send an English army into France.[1]

But alas for York's plans and for England's peace! At this critical moment two important events occurred. Darkness settled down upon the mind of poor King Henry, and on 13th October, 1453, Queen Margaret was delivered of her first child, a boy. The birth of an heir to the throne ought to have given new strength and stability to the house of Lancaster, but no such happy result followed. Margaret of Anjou had made herself so unpopular in her husband's kingdom that evil tongues were ever wagging at her expense, and no sooner was the birth of Prince Edward announced than those who disliked the mother began to whisper that the heir born so late was not really the son of the king, but only a changeling.[2]

The birth of the Prince of Wales destroyed at once and for ever York's hope that he himself would be recognized as Henry's heir, while at the same time Henry's helplessness necessitated the appointment of someone to act as regent. Who would be chosen for the post? The answer was of vital importance, and all parties prepared for a struggle. Oaths and promises were thrown to the winds, and York, in spite of what he had sworn at St. Paul's, was again ready for action. As it turned out, however, the duke gained his end without need of recourse to violent measures. Somerset was sent to the Tower, after an attempt to impeach him, and on 3rd April, 1454, York was appointed protector and defender of the realm and chief councillor of the king.[3]

So again civil war had been narrowly averted. But this time the disaster had been warded off by the victory, instead of by the defeat, of the Duke of York. And no one took more delight in the duke's success than his two young sons at Ludlow. Whether or not it was true that the Earl of March had started to his father's assistance two years before, at least it would seem that he had been at his father's side during the troubled months immediately preceding the establishment of the protectorate, since one who wrote from London on 19th January, 1454, reported that the Duke of York was expected in the city in a few days and that the Earl of

---

[1] Chartier, Chronique de Charles VII, III, 95.

[2] Fabyan's Chronicle, 628. It was reported that Henry himself remarked that the Prince "must be the son of the Holy Spirit." Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 58.

[3] Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 159; Rolls of Parl., V, 242.

March was coming with him.[1] But Edward must have rejoined his brother Edmund at Ludlow before or soon after his father's appointment as regent, as two letters are still extant which he and his brother wrote to their father from Ludlow in reply to one which the duke had written to them on 29th May from York, whither he had gone to put down an uprising.

The first of these quaint boyish epistles is dated 3rd June, and in it the two lads, after recommending themselves to their father "in as lowly wise as any sons can or may," hasten to tell him that the news of his victory over his enemies is the most comfortable tidings they could receive. But news of their own good conduct, they trust, will not be unwelcome even at such an hour, and they have also a little favour to ask. "And if it please your Highness to know of our welfare, at the making of this letter we were in good health of bodies, thanked be God, beseeching your good gracious fatherhood of your daily blessing. And where ye command us by your said letters to attend specially to our learning in our young age that should cause us to grow to honour and worship in our old age, please it your Highness to wit that we have attended our learning sith we come hither, and shall hereafter; by the which we trust to God your gracious lordship and good fatherhood shall be pleased. Also we beseech your good lordship that it may please you to send us Harry Lovedeyne, groom of your kitchen, whose service is to us right agreeable; and we will send you John Boyes to wait on your good lordship."[2]

In their second letter, which seems to have been written some months after the first, the little earls express the same hearty pleasure in their father's good fortune, while, as before, they manage to weave in a few other matters which were of great moment in their eyes, if not in their father's. "We thank your noblesse and good fatherhood of our green gowns now late sent unto us to our great comfort; beseeching your good lordship to remember our porteux[3] and that we might have some fine bonnets sent unto us by the next sure messenger, for necessity so requireth. Over this, right noble lord and father, please it your Highness to wit that we have charged your servant, William Smyth, bearer of these, for to declare unto your nobley certain things on our behalf, namely, concerning and touching the odious rule and demeaning of Richard Crofte and of his brother. Wherefore we beseech your gracious lordship and full noble fatherhood to hear him in exposition of the same, and to his relation to give full faith and credence."[1]

---

[1] Paston Letters, II, 296. The writer, after speaking of York's expected coming, goes on to say that the Earl of March "cometh with him, but he will have another fellowship of good men that shall be at London before him." Dr. Gairdner (Paston Letters, I, 135) and Mr. Stratford conclude from this that the young earl already had a separate household of his own; but it seems to me more likely that the pronoun in the second clause refers, not to March, but to the Duke of York.

[2] Paston Letters, I, 148-149; Excerpta Hist., 8-9.

[3] Breviaries.

The pleasure of knowing whether the relation made to the duke by William Smyth received the desired faith and credence is denied us, but as exciting events were soon to drag the older of the two writers of these letters from the peaceful seclusion of Ludlow Castle into a war-torn world, he at least did not have to endure much longer the "odious rule" of the Croftes.

York's protectorate lasted so short a time that he was given no chance to work out a policy. The closing days of 1454 found King Henry restored to health, and immediately after Margaret of Anjou succeeded in gaining the ascendency. Through Margaret's influence Somerset was set at liberty, the Earl of Salisbury was required to give up the great seal, which York had intrusted to him, to Thomas Bourchier, Archbishop of Canterbury, the Earl of Wiltshire was made treasurer, and the protectorate came to an end. However, Margaret and Somerset were baulked in their desire to take revenge on York, as the duke realized that he was in danger and did not wait to be attacked. Backed by the Earl of Salisbury, by Salisbury's powerful son, the Earl of Warwick, by Lord Clinton and Sir Robert Ogle, the duke immediately took up arms again and, with these friends and his eldest son, began to move on London.[2] Once more, too, the duke appealed to public opinion through a manifesto, which he drew up on 20th May, 1455, with the assistance and advice of Warwick and Salisbury. In this manifesto the duke and his friends declared that they meant no ill either to the king or to his people. But they understood, they said, that the king had summoned his council to Leicester "for surety of his most noble person," and in as much as they wished to be of assistance to the king, if he was in danger, and as it was a risk for the Duke of York to present himself before his sovereign when his enemies were conspiring against him, they had assembled their followers. They sent a copy of their manifesto directly to Henry, enclosing with it a letter which was couched in terms of devoted loyalty, but the king never saw either letter or manifesto, as both were pocketed by Somerset and two of his tools, Thomas Thorpe, recently Speaker of the House of Commons, and one William Joseph.[1]

---

[1] Ellis, Orig. Letters, Series I, Vol. I, 9-10; Halliwell, Letters of the Kings of Eng., I, 121; Archæologia, XVII, 224.

[2] Three Fifteenth Cent. Chron., 151-152; Paston Letters, III, 30.

In the meantime Henry had left Westminster for the council meeting at Leicester referred to in York's manifesto,[2] and as it was suspected that York meant to appear on the scene with an armed force, he took with him an army and an imposing array of the great lords of his kingdom, including two of York's brothers-in-law, the Duke of Buckingham and the Earl of Northumberland, and also the duke's former friend and supporter, the Earl of Devonshire.[3] But at St. Albans the king and his army ran against York and his army. York again sent assurances of his loyalty, but as he also demanded the surrender of "such as we will accuse" and made it clear that he was not going to be put off with mere promises this time, he received a very haughty and threatening answer composed, in all likelihood, by Somerset himself.[4] After this bloodshed was inevitable, and in the battle which ensued, in the very heart of the town of St. Albans, Edward, Earl of March, probably received his baptism of fire.[5] Nor was there any lack of blood-spilling on the occasion; for, in addition to the common folk who gave up their lives, the Duke of Somerset, the Earl of Northumberland, and Lord Clifford were killed, while among the wounded were the king himself, who was hit in the neck by an arrow, the Duke of Buckingham, the Earl of Stafford, Buckingham's son, who subsequently died of his wounds, the Earl of Dorset, Somerset's son and heir, and a man of whom much more will soon be heard, Sir John Wenlock, Queen Margaret's chamberlain.[6] The defeat of the royal army was complete, and yet after their victory

---

[1] Rolls of Parl., V, 280-282; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 93.

[2] Flenley, Six Town Chronicles of England, 158; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 151. Cf. Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 16-17.

[3] Yet when Devonshire died, in January, 1458, Queen Margaret was suspected of having poisoned him. Davies' Eng. Chron., 75.

[4] Paston Letters, III, 25-27; Stow, 390.

[5] Mr. Stratford decided that Edward was not present at the battle of St. Albans, but, instead, was taking some men to Leicester to join the Yorkist forces there. But he cites a passage in Three Fifteenth Cent. Chron. as his authority, and what that passage says is, not that March was going to Leicester with a separate body of men, but, on the contrary, that he was with his father, who had brought a large army to strengthen himself against the Duke of Somerset "ad concilium domini Regis versus Leycester."

[6] Letters of Margaret of Anjou, 112.

York, Warwick, and Salisbury kneeled humbly before the king, begging him to forgive them and declaring that they had never intended to do him harm. And when Henry had forgiven them (what else could he do?), he was taken back to London, made to participate in a thanksgiving procession to St. Paul's, and then permitted to live in the Bishop of London's palace.[1]

A great pretence of respect for the king had been kept up even in the moment of victory, but Somerset was no more and the Yorkists seized control of the government. Archbishop Bourchier, a clever time-server, succeeded in retaining the great seal, but York's brother-in-law, Viscount Bourchier, was made treasurer, York himself took the office of constable of England, and to the Earl of Warwick was given the captaincy of Calais, the most important military post in the gift of the crown and one which Somerset had formerly held.[2] So certain did it seem that the victory of the Yorkists would prove to be permanent that several of the leading Lancastrians, including the Duke of Buckingham and the Earl of Wiltshire, discreetly made their peace with them. Sir John Wenlock did even more. He experienced an entire change of heart and became a devoted Yorkist. On the other hand, Lord Dudley had to be sent to the Tower, and the Earl of Dorset was committed to ward in the house of the Earl of Warwick.[3] Parliament met, Wenlock was chosen speaker, the blame for everything was thrown on Somerset, Thomas Thorpe, and William Joseph, and a new oath of allegiance to Henry VI was demanded of Yorkist and Lancastrian lords alike.

The house of Lancaster had weathered another storm, but the strain had been too great for the king's frail constitution. Early in the autumn of 1455 Henry's health again broke down and York was once more made protector of the realm. But the king recovered so quickly that the duke's second protectorate was even briefer than the first had been. In February, 1456, York very reluctantly gave up his office, and as Queen Margaret, even when deprived of Somerset's support, was a determined and dangerous antagonist, more trouble soon broke out. With the help of the Duke of Buckingham, who vainly hoped that he could reconcile the rival factions, York was able to keep control through the summer months, but in October Margaret succeeded in turning the Yorkist ministers out. With that much of a victory the queen decided to be content, but it was enough to drive the Yorkists from court. York withdrew to Wigmore Castle, in Herefordshire, Salisbury retired to Yorkshire, to his castle at Middleham, and Warwick found an excuse for going to Calais, the captaincy of which Margaret had not ventured to take from him.[1]

---

[1] Paston Letters; Fabyan; Kingsford's London Chron. See also a letter in Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 16-17, in which the writer states that Somerset's son was mortally wounded and, in a postscript, that Somerset, instead of being killed on the field, was taken and beheaded. Both statements are incorrect. Somerset's son survived to give the Yorkists much more trouble.

[2] Paston Letters, III, 31; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 242. Warwick seems to have been appointed captain of Calais immediately after the battle, although the indentures were not drawn up until 4th August and the letters patent not until 13th August. Rolls of Parl., V, 309, 341; French Roll 33 Hen. VI, m. 11.

[3] Paston Letters, III, 32-33.

The loss of his hard-won authority was a bitter disappointment to York, and as troubles never come singly, almost at the same moment the duke received another blow. Although during neither of his protectorates had he been able to plan for the renewal of the war with France, his wishes had not changed, nor had he dropped his negotiations with the Duke of Alençon, who had turned an attentive ear to his proposals.[2] Suddenly, however, all hope of help from Alençon was dashed for ever, as that gentleman's intrigues with the enemies of France had become known to Charles VII and in May, 1456, he was arrested. Two years later, when he was brought to trial, York's friend was condemned to imprisonment and the forfeiture of all his goods, and in this way the duke lost the ally in France on whose support he had been counting, while the Earl of March lost the second French bride his father had courted for him.

During the year 1457 no material change occurred in the political situation in England. At a meeting of the great council held at Coventry early in the year peace was preserved with difficulty, but in the end York and Warwick again swore allegiance to Henry and consented to put their signatures to an order that no lord should use force against another but, if he felt he had a grievance, should make complaint to the king and obtain redress by law. On this occasion York was warned that he need not look for pardon if he disturbed the peace again, and, to get rid of him, in March he was reappointed lieutenant of Ireland. But if the duke's enemies hoped that he would submit to banishment a second time,

[1] Paston Letters, III, 75; Kingsford's London Chron., 167; Fabyan, 631.
[2] Chartier, III, 99.

disappointment was in store for them, for he did not leave England.[1] He was only biding his time again, and at the end of August occurred an event which threw so much discredit on the already unpopular rule of Margaret of Anjou that, had her enemies been prepared to act at once, she might have been at their mercy. Pierre de Brezé, grand seneschal of Anjou, Poitou, and Normandy, a man who had been instrumental in bringing about Margaret's marriage with Henry and yet had led a raid on the Yorkshire coast in November, 1451,[2] landed on the coast of Kent and pillaged Sandwich. The French raiders spent a whole day in Sandwich before they were driven out by Sir Thomas Kyriell, and six weeks later, though meanwhile commissions of array had been pouring out of the Chancery, the inhabitants of the east coast were still shaking in their shoes.[3]

The looting of Sandwich was a national disgrace which Henry VI's subjects never forgot, and according to a contemporary French chronicler, it was Margaret of Anjou who was responsible for it. The queen invited Brezé's attack, says Mathieu d'Escouchy, out of hatred to the Duke of York.[4] It is hard to see how Margaret's ends could be furthered by a deed so foul, but there is only too good reason to believe that she at least approved of what Brezé had done. For she continued to regard the grand seneschal as a friend, and, to judge from a conversation which Brezé's confidential agent, Morice Doulcereau, had with Richard Beauchamp, Bishop of Salisbury, at Calais some time later, she even thought of employing the pillager of Sandwich to obtain a treaty with France. Beauchamp represented himself as King Henry's spokesman, and after he had made Doulcereau swear an oath on the Holy Evangelists not to repeat what he said to anyone save Brezé himself, he sang Brezé's praises, extolled him for his descent on Sandwich and the manner in which he had treated his prisoners, declared that the seneschal enjoyed a high reputation in England, and expressed a wish to treat through him for a *bonne paix* between England and France. The English would prefer such a treaty, the bishop declared, to their alliance with the Duke of Burgundy, whom they no longer trusted.[1]

---

[1] Flenley's Six Town Chron., 159; Rolls of Parl., V, 347; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 341; Stubbs, Cons. Hist. of Eng., III, 181.

[2] Nicolas's London Chron., 137; Kingsford, Eng. Hist. Lit. in the Fif. Cent., 367. Brezé was devotedly attached to Margaret's father. Chastellain, Œuvres, IV, 228.

[3] Fabyan, 632; Davies' Eng. Chron., 74; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 70-71; Chronicle of John Stone, 69; Records of the City of Norwich, I, 404; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 371, 401-405.

[4] Chron. de Mathieu d'Escouchy, II, 353.

A rumour that Brezé had attacked Sandwich at Margaret's bidding would find ready credence in England, and it was probably to save herself that the Queen made a scapegoat of the Duke of Exeter. Exeter had been admiral of England for ten years, but at the beginning of October the keeping of the sea was taken out of his hands, to his deep disgust, and, apparently not only to conciliate the Yorkists but to pacify the people in general, given to the Earl of Warwick.[2] From that day forth Exeter felt an intense hatred, if not for his father-in-law, the Duke of York, at least for his father-in-law's friends. But the enmity of Exeter was a price the Yorkists could well afford to pay, as it was Warwick's command of the sea, added to his control of Calais, that made the coming Yorkist rising possible.

Early in 1458 both Yorkists and Lancastrians were summoned to another meeting of the great council at Westminster. Warwick came over from Calais with a large band of men garbed in red jackets adorned with white ragged staves, his well known badge, while the Lancastrian lords brought retinues of such a size that London's magistrates took fright and declined to give them lodging. Had civil war broken out within Westminster Palace itself, no one would have been astonished. But once more the danger passed. York, Warwick, and Salisbury promised to make certain compensation to the heirs of the Lancastrian lords who had fallen at St. Albans and to give money to the monastery there for prayers and almsgiving for the souls of all who had perished in the battle, and then, on 25th March, in celebration of this happy settlement, the king and queen and the great lords all went together in procession to St. Paul's. Henry wore his royal robes and his crown, and before him walked the Earl of Salisbury with the young Duke of Somerset, formerly Earl of Dorset, who had now succeeded to his father's place in Margaret of Anjou's affections, and the Earl of Warwick with his special rival, the Duke of Exeter, while behind the king came the Duke of York, who "led the queen with great familiarity to all men's sights."[1]

---

[1] See Abbé Legrand's manuscript history of the reign of Louis XI, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS. français 6960, ff. 421-422. Doulcereau was taken prisoner at the battle of Northampton (10th July, 1460), and, according to Legrand, his conversation with the Bishop of Salisbury occurred as he was returning home after his liberation. This must be wrong, however, as by the time of the battle of Northampton Beauchamp had come out as a friend of the Yorkists. Legrand also states that Beauchamp was on his way to Normandy in search of facts concerning the life of St. Osmund, for whose canonization he was working; but as Osmund was canonized on 1st January, 1457 (Dict. Nat. Biog.), some months, that is, before Brezé's attack on Sandwich, something is wrong here also. Doulcereau went to Calais in 1458 to deliver a safe-conduct sent by Charles VII for Sir John Wenlock and Louis Galet (Stevenson, Letters and Papers, I, 358-360), and it was probably at that time that his conversation with Beauchamp really took place. Beauchamp afterwards wrote a letter to Brezé, which the grand seneschal forwarded to Charles VII from Rouen with a brief letter from himself. It is among Legrand's notes, MSS. français 6965, f. 237, and 6970, f. 111, but as it is dated merely Rouen, 8th June, the year is left in doubt.

[2] Paston Letters, III, 125; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 390, 413; Rymer, Fœdera, XI, 406.

The procession to St. Paul's was an edifying spectacle, but it had little real meaning and probably deceived no one. Queen Margaret might consent to walk by York's side, but she certainly did not trust him and he certainly did not trust her, and when the "love-day" was over, the same grumblings were heard among the people, the same bitterness filled the hearts of the leaders of both factions, and the same suspicions, if possible growing stronger every day, lurked in minds which had been poisoned by long experience of bad faith and violated promises. Neither party could show a clean record. Promises had been made to York without intention of fulfilment, while the duke, on his side, had sworn solemn oaths and afterwards done the very things he swore he would not do. York might plead that the oath which he had taken at St. Paul's had been wrung from him at a time when he was virtually a prisoner of enemies who had not hesitated to make false promises in order to get him into their power, but the queen might plead with equal justice that the duke had been guilty of actions which made it necessary to hold him in check by any means that offered, and that he had taken other oaths under other conditions and violated those also. It was little wonder, therefore, that the reconciliation which had been celebrated with so much show of cordiality turned out to be a sham. The storm which had calmed down for a moment soon burst out afresh and with greater violence than ever.

Warwick had been allowed to retain both the captaincy of Calais and the guardianship of the sea, and during the summer of 1458 he displayed much energy, of a rather piratical character, in attacking a large Spanish fleet which was passing by Calais on its way to

---

[1] Fabyan, 633; Kingsford's London Chron., 168; Davies' Eng. Chron., 77; Whethamstede, I, 298-308; Flenley's Six Town Chron., 160; Hall, 238.

Flanders and later a salt fleet belonging to the city of Lubeck.[1] These successes added greatly to the earl's fame both at home and abroad and won him much popularity, especially among sailors, but on that very account they excited the jealousy of Queen Margaret and those who were now her chief advisers, the Earls of Wiltshire and Shrewsbury and Viscount Beaumont. In the meantime, too, York was carrying on negotiations with foreign powers which, if Margaret heard of them—and some hint regarding them would almost surely reach her ears—must have added still more to her distrust of him.

By this time York had ceased to hope that he would be able to lead his country into a renewal of the war in France, and it was for the friendship and support of Charles VII himself that he was now bidding, and bidding high. In the spring of this year the duke made very important offers to Charles, though just what was their nature is not known.[2] However, Charles's councillors did not approve of his having dealings with a man who had rebelled against his king, and when the duke found that his offers had been rejected, he changed his plans and turned his attentions to Philip of Burgundy, England's whilom ally against France. During the summer of 1458 negotiations in regard to some breaches of the truce between England and Burgundy were going on between Philip and an English embassy of which Warwick was the guiding spirit, and later events go to prove that in the course of the negotiations Warwick succeeded in establishing a secret understanding between Philip and the Yorkist leaders.[3] Yet, in spite of that understanding, when, in the autumn, Sir John Wenlock and Master Louis Galet went to Philip with a proposal for a triple marriage alliance—the daughter of Philip's son, Charles, Count of Charolais, and the Princesses of Bourbon and Gueldres to be the brides of the Prince of Wales, a son of the Duke of York (no doubt meaning the Earl of March), and the Duke of Somerset[1]—Philip seems to have shown so little eagerness that afterwards, when they went to meet some French commissioners and talk about a truce between England and France, the English envoys proposed a triple marriage alliance to Charles VII also. This time it was one of the French king's daughters and the daughters of the Duke of Orleans and the Count of Maine whose hands were requested for the Prince of Wales, York's son, and Somerset. But Charles replied, if not unfavourably, at least evasively, and this marriage scheme too came to naught.[2]

---

[1] Paston Letters, III, 130; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 71; Fabyan, 633; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 443; Hansisches Urkundenbuch, VIII, 480-481, 484-486; Hanserecesse, II, 4, pp. 473-474, and II, 5, p. 98. Whethamstede (I, 330-331) gives a glowing account of Warwick's victory over a fleet of Genoese and Spanish carracks, which, according to his story, took place on 22nd June, 1459. See, however, Paston Letters, I, 178, note 3. On 4th December, 1460, one William Staveley petitioned for a grant of the tax levied on aliens at Calais, asserting that he had served King Henry for fifteen years at Calais and on the sea, that he had been wounded many times, and that "now late time was upon the sea with your true knight, my Lord of Warwick, when he fought with the Spaniards and carracks, and there hurt with a gun and likely thereof to be maimed for fault of help and succour, without the mercy of God and your gracious reward." Signed Bills, file 1477, no. 6640. A year later the petitioner got what he asked for, but the donor was, not Henry VI, but Edward IV. Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 61.

[2] See the statement of the Count of Foix printed in Lenglet du Fresnoy's edition of Commynes' Mémoires, II, 310-311. The count said that York's offers were made to Charles "à Remorantin au partir de Montrichart." Charles was at Montrichard on 23rd May, 1458. Ordonnances des rois de France, XIV, 466. Cf. Beaucourt, Hist. de Charles VII, VI, 260.

[3] Two years later Warwick was called a great friend of Philip's. Cal.

In August, 1458, a meeting of the king's council was called for 11th October.[3] As before, Yorkists as well as Lancastrians were summoned, and when they came, a vulgar brawl between Warwick's servants and some of the menials of the king's household, which began with an exchange of fisticuffs in Westminster Hall, set a hurricane loose. Warwick himself, as he was coming from the council chamber, was set upon by the infuriated cooks and scullery boys, and it was only thanks to the aid of some of the other lords of the council that he succeeded in reaching his barge and escaping to the city. As the earl's men had been decidedly worsted in this ridiculous fray, his enemies ought to have been well content with the day's work, but they were not. Margaret and her coterie chose to hold the earl personally responsible for all that had happened, and, to escape being thrust into the Tower, he had to retire to Warwick Castle and afterwards to Calais.[4]

The attack on Warwick angered all the Yorkists, and, to

Milanese Papers, I, 22.

[1] The *son* of the Duke of Somerset, according to the news letter printed in Stevenson, Letters and Papers, I, 361-377. But the writer of that letter must have forgotten for the moment that Edmund Beaufort, Duke of Somerset, was dead. Henry Beaufort, Duke of Somerset, never had any legitimate children. It must have been for Somerset himself, therefore, that a bride was sought.

[2] Beaucourt, VI, 260-263. Cf. J. du Clercq, Mémoires, livre III, c.xl, and Stevenson, Letters and Papers, *ut sup.*

[3] Privy Council Proceedings, VI, 297.

[4] According to Fabyan and Kingsford's London Chron., this brawl occurred about Candlemas Day. But Davies' Eng. Chron., an earlier authority, says it took place on 9th November.

make matters worse, soon after it Margaret endeavoured to drive the earl out of his stronghold by notifying him that he must deliver up Calais to Somerset. But Warwick had no intention of submitting to such treatment. He declared that, as he had received his appointment to the captaincy of Calais from parliament, he could not be deprived of it by any mere writ of privy seal, and that he would keep Calais if it cost him all the lands he had in England.[1] And since Margaret was without means to enforce her order, he remained in command both at Calais and on the sea. The keeping of the sea the queen dared not even attempt to take away from him.[2]

Excitement was now running high throughout England, and it was evident that the truce between the queen and her friends and York and his friends would soon break down entirely. A bloody rain which fell in Bedfordshire was regarded as a certain portent of approaching disaster, but the restlessness of the country was a much surer sign that something unpleasant was about to happen. No parliament had been summoned for three years, and the king's debts were piling up day by day. Hundreds if not thousands of pounds were owing for the expenses of the household; the wages of the garrison at Calais had not been paid, and salaries of all kinds were hopelessly in arrears.[3] Yet it was said that the officers of the crown, especially the treasurer, the Earl of Wiltshire, were laying up great riches.[4] All honest men were disgusted with a government which had allowed the king to impoverish himself by reckless alienation of the crown lands, which had spent the people's money without stint yet to no profit, which had even failed to prevent the French from collecting booty on the coast of Kent. And the person who was especially blamed for all these things was the king's French wife.

---

[1] Stevenson, Letters and Papers, I, 368-369; Davies' Eng. Chron. 78-79., In an indenture which Lord Mountjoy and James Blount, lieutenants of Hammes Castle, signed with Edward IV, they promised not to deliver the said castle to anyone except the king or his heirs, kings of England, "or by his or their commandment by his or their letters under their great seal." Exchequer Accounts, bundle 72, no. 2.

[2] As late as March, 1459, ships were being equipped by the royal command to serve under Warwick. Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 494, 496.

[3] At the close of 1458 an arrangement was made with the merchants of the staple by which they undertook to provide £1000 quarterly for four years for the support of the king's household. *Ibid.*, pp. 500-501. Yet in January, 1461, there was a debt of £460 for meat purveyed for the household. Warrants for Issues, 39 Hen. VI, 30th Jan. As a sample of unpaid salaries, it may be mentioned that the wages of John Cave, yeoman of the king's tents and pavilions, had not been paid for two years and a half. *Ibid.* 38 Hen. VI, 17th Dec.

[4] Davies' Eng. Chron.

More and more Margaret of Anjou had become the object of popular dislike and distrust, and she was now accused of direct implication in the Earl of Wiltshire's evil practices. Nor had the insulting stories about the birth of the Prince of Wales died out. Some persons were now ready to say that the Prince had been begotten in adultery, and there is more than one hint that the late Duke of Somerset was suspected of being the queen's paramour. The queen was also thought to be trying to bring about her husband's abdication in order to insure her son's succession to the throne.[1] In brief, there was no sin Margaret might have committed of which her enemies did not sooner or later accuse her. And yet there is no doubt that the mass of the people were still loyal to Henry himself, whose gentleness and piety, whose very weakness, had endeared him to his subjects, and that there were many persons who felt that the Duke of York, although upon him all hope of better government seemed to depend, had already gone too far. In consequence there were violent differences of opinion, as every man espoused this cause or that, and even within the walls of convents and colleges wordy contentions interrupted study, meditation, and prayer.[2]

In the spring of 1459 Margaret was quite openly preparing for a trial of strength with her adversaries,[3] and yet the summer came and went in peace. Perhaps this was because the queen, like York himself, was seeking aid outside of England as well as within it.

There was an ill-kept truce at this time between England and Scotland which had been signed in 1453 and prolonged in 1457. Of this truce Margaret was now trying to obtain a further extension, and under cover of the negotiations for this purpose, there is reason to believe, she was also endeavouring to secure a promise of help against York, who, as a former ally of the Douglases, was regarded with no kindly eye by the house of Stuart. The prospect of a fresh truce with Scotland did not put a stop to the payment of an annuity of five hundred pounds which the Earl of Douglas had been receiving from Henry VI ever since

[1] *Ibid.*, Du Clercq, liv, IV, c.xvii; Basin I, 289-299; Chastellain, V, 464.

[2] Historiæ Croylandensis Continuatio, 526.

[3] Paston Letters, III, 138-139; Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, 511; Davies' Eng. Chron., 79.

his flight to England in 1455, nor did it prevent James II from leading a raid into England in the middle of August;[1] yet in September English and Scottish commissioners met at Newcastle and the truce was extended until 1468.[2] More than that, if the Scottish historian, Lesley, is to be believed, in return for a promise of help against the Duke of York and the Earl of Warwick the English commissioners pledged to James II the counties of Northumberland, Cumberland, and Durham, with "other sheriffdoms which the king of Scotland had of before and been withheld from them divers years past."[3] But if this shameful pledge was actually given, it was never to be fulfilled. For York too was intriguing at the Scottish court, and events were pending which were to change the whole course of history in England.

At the moment the new truce with Scotland was being signed, York was at Ludlow with his sons; Salisbury, with two of his younger sons, Sir Thomas and Sir John Neville, was at Middleham, and Warwick was at Calais.[4] By the middle of September, however, the three earls had agreed to meet and proceed towards the king with an armed force large enough not only to protect them from their enemies, but to insure them a hearing. Salisbury was to join York at Ludlow, and Warwick was to come over from Calais with a part of the garrison there. But from some source Margaret got an inkling of these plans, and, taking her son with her, she started for Chester to assemble the Prince's tenants, while Henry soon left Kenilworth and set out after her. Before the king had time to join her, Margaret turned back to Eccleshall, and there she learned that Salisbury was nearing the point at which he must be intercepted, if he was to be intercepted at all. Consequently, without waiting for her husband, the queen sent Lord Audley forward to waylay the earl. Audley encountered the Yorkists on Blore Heath, near Market Drayton, on 23rd September and fought with them from one o'clock till five, but although, according to all accounts, he had the larger force, the victory did not fall to him. He was slain in the battle and many of his men died with him or, like Lord Dudley, were taken prisoners. Yet not quite all the casualities were on Audley's side. Sir Thomas Harington

[1] Rymer, XI, 421; Auchinleck Chronicle, 20, 56.

[2] Rymer, XI, 426; Exchequer Rolls of Scotland, VI, lxi-lxii.

[3] Lesley, Hist. of Scotland, 29-30. The year given is 1458, but it seems clear that 1459 is meant. Cf. Exchequer Rolls of Scotland, VI, lxiv.

[4] Rolls of Parl., V., 348.

and Sir Thomas and Sir John Neville pursued the fleeing Lancastrians a little too far and on the morning after the battle were captured at the bridge at Acton by the son of a Lancastrian knight who had fallen the day before, and were sent to Chester Castle for safe keeping. A few other prisoners were taken in a Shropshire forest and afterwards executed because they were wearing the livery of Lord Stanley, who had been summoned to the king's aid time and again before he came and, when at last he did come, had sat idly by during the fighting.[1]

After the battle Salisbury marched on to Ludlow, where he found York surrounded by an army which gave hope that a greater victory than that of Blore Heath would soon bring Margaret of Anjou and her friends to their knees. The men of the marches, many of whom were tenants or retainers of York or his son Edward, had been mustered in, and among others who had come to offer their services were Lord Clinton, Lord Powis, Sir Walter Devereux, Sir John Wenlock, Sir James Pickering, Sir John Conyers, Sir Thomas Parre, Sir Harry Radford, and two members of the Bourchier family, John and Edward.[2] Better still, Warwick was on his way to Ludlow and was bringing with him many of the best soldiers of the Calais garrison under the command of two famous veterans of the French wars, John Blount and Andrew Trollope. These trained men from Calais would be a particularly valuable addition to the Yorkist forces, and, to judge from the curious prominence given to him by the French chroniclers, Andrew Trollope, master porter of Calais, enjoyed a reputation for prowess which was enough to scare a whole army into flight.

About the time he landed in England, Warwick issued a manifesto which, like the Yorkist manifestoes of 1452 and 1455, was intended to explain and justify the taking up of arms by those who claimed to be the king's best friends. The laws of the realm were overthrown, this manifesto declared, the king's income

[1] Davies' Eng. Chron., 80; Whethamstede, I., 338; Gregory, 204; Fabyan, 634; Kingsford's London Chron., 169; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 72; Rolls of Parl., V., 348, 369-370. Gregory says the capture of Harington and the Nevilles took place at Tarporley, but Henry afterwards granted to one Thomas Harper, yeoman of the Tower, a messuage belonging to Sir Thomas Parre as a reward for the good services he had rendered, especially "in taking of our rebels in our county of Chester, where he was one of the first that countered with them at Acton Bridge, to the great jeopardy of his life." Writs of Privy Seal, file 777, 20th December, See also Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 536. Acton is on the road between Nantwich and Tarporley but is much nearer Nantwich than Tarporley.

[2] Rolls of Parl., V, 348; Fabyan, *ut sup.;* Hall, 241.

was so reduced that money had to be raised by unlawful means to support his household, and crime was encouraged instead of punished. Yet the blame for all this rested, not with the king, but with "certain persons" who craftily hid the truth from him; and the earl explained that, as no Christian land could prosper when the prince thereof was robbed of his livelihood and kept in ignorance of the true state of his kingdom, he and his friends proposed to go to the king, acquaint him with the facts, and beg him to remedy what was wrong and punish those who were responsible for it. They were ready to help the king to do this, he said, and they were also ready to promise not to "take upon us any private rule or entry into any matter for our profit, or to call to mind any old debate or argument between any estate of this land and any of us," or to seek any unlawful revenge.[1]

Although he had ships at his disposal and was beloved by the sailors, Warwick chose to go to Ludlow, not by sea, but straight through the heart of England. That his odd choice did not prove a foolhardy one shows how little the kingdom was prepared, or else how little disposed, to resist the Yorkists. Landing in Kent, the earl went at once to London, which he reached three days after the battle of Blore Heath,[2] and if the city did not welcome him with open arms, at least it made no attempt to interfere with his plans.[3] The only point, in fact, at which the earl's march across the kingdom seems to have been in any danger of interruption was at Coleshill, about eighteen miles from his own castle of Warwick, whither Somerset had been dispatched to waylay him, as Audley had been sent to waylay Salisbury at Blore Heath. But Somerset arrived at Coleshill too late, as Warwick, he found, had already passed through the town.[4]

As soon as Warwick reached Ludlow, the Yorkist leaders drew up another protestation of loyalty to Henry and sent it to the king by the hands of the prior of Worcester cathedral.[5] To this

[1] See Stow's transcript of this manifesto in Harleian MS. 543, f. 164a. Stow gives to the document the title, "Articles of ye Erle of Warwike comyng fro Cales before ye fild of Ludlow, anno 1459."

[2] Flenley's Six Town Chron., 147-148.

[3] A letter from the king ordering that no "habiliments of war" were to be given to York, Salisbury, Warwick, or their adherents was read to the common council of London on 26th September, and the wardens of the companies of bowyers, fletchers, haberdashers, and upholders were enjoined by the council to live up to the order. London Journal 6, f. 138b. But Warwick had probably already left the city.

[4] Gregory, 205.

[5] Davies' Eng. Chron., 81. Cf. Waurin, Anchiennes chronicques d'Engle-

no response was made. Still, Henry and his advisers were really quite as anxious as the Yorkists to avoid further bloodshed, and when the king, who had now joined his army, arrived at Worcester, it was decided to try the effect of an offer of amnesty. The Bishop of Salisbury was sent to the Yorkist lords with a written promise from Henry that, if they would seek his grace within six days, they should have a general pardon for themselves and for all their followers, with the exception of a few men who had been proclaimed after the battle of Blore Heath. But the victors of Blore Heath were not to be bought off so cheaply. Warwick replied in the name of all that for three reasons the King's offer could not be accepted. In the first place, he said, he and his friends had discovered that a royal pardon, even when it had been confirmed by parliament, was worthless; in the second place, it was not safe to trust the men now surrounding the king, as they shamelessly disobeyed his commands; and in the third place, although it was the law of the land that members of the king's council should come and go unhindered and unharmed, he himself, at a time when he was attending a council meeting at Westminster, had been saved from death only by God's help. Yet, even while they rejected the offered pardon, the Yorkists still asserted their loyalty.[1]

When it became known that the offer of pardon had failed, the king's army advanced threateningly towards Ludlow, and it was in vain that, on 10th October, by which time Henry had reached Leominster,[2] Warwick and Salisbury sent him another letter protesting with great emphasis that they did not intend to resort to force unless they were compelled to do so in self defence, that it was only to shield themselves that they had gathered together their friends, and that it was their enemies who were responsible for all the blood that had been shed.[3] The king's army continued to move nearer and nearer, and the Yorkists at last drew up their forces in battle array at Ludford, a village

---

terre, II, 192-193, where it is said the envoys of the Yorkists were sent from Exeter, which is obviously incorrect, and that they found the king at Northampton, which is equally wrong. Waurin's geography often needs correction, and he shows a fondness for manufacturing details which greatly impairs the value of his narrative.

[1] Rolls of Parl., V., 348; Whethamstede, I, 339; Davies' Eng. Chron., 81.

[2] Reports from the Lords' Committees touching the Dignity of a Peer of the Realm, IV, 940.

[3] Davies' Eng. Chron., 81-83; Stow, 405-406. The text of the letter, as it has come down to us, is obviously corrupt.

scarcely more than a stone's throw from Ludlow, though separated from it by the river Teme. There they waited behind the fortified trench with which they had protected their camp for whatever might befall.[1] But unfortunately no trench could protect the Duke of York and his friends from the most serious danger that threatened them. Among the men gathered about the duke were some who were strongly opposed to bearing arms against their king, and by one chronicler it is stated that, before they consented to follow Warwick to England, Andrew Trollope and the men of the Calais garrison had definitely stipulated that they were not to be led against the king.[2] In any case, on such a man as Trollope, an adventurer and an ex-pirate who had been as ready to rob an English ship as a foreign one,[3] little reliance could safely be placed, and if there was any truth in the story afterwards told that the Yorkist leaders gave their troops to understand that Henry had died, brought persons into their camp who swore that the king was dead, and even had a mass sung for the king's soul,[4] a suspicion that Trollope and his men were preparing to mutiny or desert probably explains their action.

Late in the afternoon of 12th October the king's army approached within half a mile of the Yorkists' position and, after another offer of pardon to all who would implore the king's mercy had been vainly proclaimed within hearing of the enemy, preparations were made for battle. But though some shots were exchanged that evening, the expected battle was never fought, for the reason that, after nightfall, Trollope and many of the Calais men stole away to the king. Trollope's defection was a staggering blow to the Yorkists not simply because it meant the loss of a considerable and probably the best trained part of their army, but because he was cognizant of all their plans. So on discovering what had happened, York and his closest friends held hurried consultation, came to the conclusion that prudence was the better part of valor, and fled for their lives. The next day, when it was learned that the Yorkist leaders had disappeared, searching parties were sent out in all directions, but no trace of the fugitives could be discovered, and the Yorkist troops, on finding themselves thus left to their own devices, surrendered to the king. A few men who were regarded as ringleaders were hanged and quartered, but most of the self-surrendered prisoners received a pardon of life on the spot and later, by order of parliament, were granted general pardons which, upon their giving surety for good behaviour and paying the treasurer of England such fines as could be agreed on, secured to them their lands and goods.[1]

---

[1] Gregory, 205; Rolls of Parl, V, 348.
[2] Waurin, II, 191. Cf. Hist. Croy. Cont., 549, and Hall, 241.
[3] See Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 179, 281, 344, 348.
[4] Rolls of Parl., V, 348.

If most of the Yorkist soldiers found mercy, not so the inhabitants of Ludlow. The town and the castle, as well as some near-by villages which belonged to the Duke of York, were "robbed to the bare walls," and the king's troops gave themselves up to enjoyment in the form of drunkenness, looting, and the outraging of women. Yet the Duchess of York and two of her sons, George and Richard, who were captured in the town, received kind treatment, for the king promised them a pardon and then sent them to be kept in ward by the duchess's own sister, the Duchess of Buckingham.[2]

When Ludlow had been sufficiently chastised, the king returned to Coventry, and there, on 20th November, a parliament, from which all sympathizers with the Yorkists had been carefully excluded,[3] met to complete the punishment of the king's routed enemies by a bill of attainder. In the premises of the bill reference was made to the great favours which the king had heaped on the Duke of York and on the Earls of Warwick and Salisbury, and then York's misdeeds were rehearsed at length. The duke had been in Ireland, it was true, at the time of Cade's rebellion, but some of Cade's men had confessed that the purpose of the insurrection had been to exalt the duke to the king's estate. Later the duke had tried to force his advice upon the king and to use his influence in parliament to the derogation of the royal authority. The duke had also attempted to stir up a rebellion (in 1452), had afterwards taken a solemn oath to the king in St. Paul's and then broken it. He had "reared war" against the king and slain divers lords of the king's blood and other people at St. Albans. Together with the Earl of Warwick, he had taken another solemn oath to the king at Coventry (in 1457) and still another at St. Paul's (in March, 1458), and yet he had broken those too and had again made war against the king. Finally, he was to blame for the battle of Blore Heath and for the attempt at resistance which had been made at Ludlow.

---

[1] Whethamstede, I, 342-345; Rolls of Parl., V, 348-349; Fabyan, 634-635; Kingsford's London Chron., 169; Gregory, 205; Waurin, II, 255; Hall, 242. See further a petition for a pardon which was sent to Henry by one John Russell and which is preserved in Signed Bills, file 1475, 16th March. Russell tells the king that he has paid a fine of £40 to the treasurer of England and reminds him, first, that on 13th October in the thirty-eighth year of his reign, "in the fields of Ludford beside Ludlow," he had granted him, together with others who submitted at that time, a charter of pardon of his life, and, second, that in the parliament held at Coventry in the same year it was enacted that "certain of your liegemen that had offended your Highness in the said fields and there of you had pardon and grace of their lives should make fine with the worshipful lord, the Earl of Wiltshire, your treasurer of England, as betwixt them might be agreed, and thereupon, after that certified to your Highness, every of those that had so offended and made fine should have your general charter of pardon of their lives, lands, tenements, possessions, goods, chattels, and debts."

[2] Gregory; Davies' Eng. Chron., 83; Whethamstede, I, 345; Fabyan, 635; Hearne's Fragment of an Old English Chronicle, 283-284; Hall, 242. One chronicler declares that the Duchess of York was "kept full straight and many a great rebuke," but in reality her confinement cannot have been very strict, as she went to Coventry in December, while parliament was in session there, and a month later we hear of her in Kent. Paston Letters, III, 198, 203.

[3] Davies' Eng. Chron., *ut. sup.*

Those who were named in the bill of attainder, besides a few persons of little importance, were the Duke of York and his two oldest sons, the Earls of March and Rutland, the Earl of Salisbury, his wife and three sons, the Earl of Warwick and Sir Thomas and Sir John Neville, Lord Clinton, Sir John Wenlock, Sir Thomas Harington, Sir John Conyers, Sir Thomas Parre, Sir James Pickering, William Stanley, Lord Stanley's brother, John and Edward Bourchier, Thomas Colt,[1] John Clay, Sir William Oldhalle, who had been Speaker of the House of Commons in 1450 and always a staunch Yorkist, and Thomas Vaughan. These persons, one and all, were to suffer attainder and forfeiture. On the other hand, Lord Powis, Sir Harry Radford, and Sir Walter Devereux, who had been with York at Ludlow but had sought the king's mercy after the duke's flight, were to be pardoned, except as to the forfeiture of their estates.[2]

To this bill, in the drafting of which Sir John Fortescue, Chief Justice of the King's Bench, Thomas Thorpe, and Doctor John Morton seem to have had a special hand,[3] the king gave his assent, save as it concerned Powis and Devereux, but he did so with

[1] Colt had been "nigh of counsel" with York ever since 1453, when he is said to have instigated the duke to bring the suit against Thomas Thorpe, then Speaker of the House of Commons, which caused Thorpe to be sent to the Fleet. Thorpe's son seems to have sought out Colt the day before the battle of Wakefield and attacked and wounded him. For this Colt afterwards recovered £2000. See Rolls of Parl., V. 295.

[2] Rolls of Parl., V, 346-349.

[3] Paston Letters, III, 226-227, 242-243. Cf. Plummer's edition of Fortescue's Governance of England, 53.

regret and only on condition that his prerogative of mercy and pardon was fully recognized.[1] Lord Powis was granted a general pardon on the last day of the session, Devereux secured one on 20th March following, and Sir Harry Radford got one eight days later.[2] For Henry VI was kind and forgiving to a fault and loth to condemn any man, no matter how strong the evidence of his guilt might be. The bulky pardon roll of this year of the king's reign is striking proof of his generosity, and probably if he had been left to follow his own inclinations, he would have pardoned all York's adherents and even the duke himself. As it was, he rejected the petition of the Commons for the attainder of Lord Stanley, who, because of his inactivity at the time of the battle of Blore Heath, was held especially responsible for that disaster. And to the Duchess of York, who came to Coventry, apparently to plead for mercy for herself and her innocent children, he granted a thousand marks a year from certain of her husband's forfeited estates "for the relief and sustentation of her and her young children that have not offended against us."[3]

The bill of attainder meted out punishment to those who had openly rebelled and, after their failure, fled. But when treason stalked in the land, who could tell which man was to be trusted? Even from those who were considered to be the king's most loyal subjects it seemed safer to secure some guarantee of faithfulness, and though, to judge from the events of the last few years, oaths of fidelity were scarcely worth the parchment they were written on, the lords of the realm were asked to sign an oath of allegiance to the Prince of Wales, as well as to Henry himself, and also a promise to protect and support not only Henry, but Henry's wife and son.[4] The spiritual lords who took the oath were the two archbishops, Thomas Bourchier and William Booth, sixteen bishops, among them George Neville, Bishop of Exeter, Salisbury's son and Warwick's brother, who had declared himself "full worshipfully, to the king's great pleasure,"[5] fourteen abbots, the Prior of Coventry, and Sir Robert Botyll, Prior of St. John's. The temporal lords who signed it were the Dukes of Exeter, Norfolk, and Buckingham, all three of whom were kinsmen by marriage of the Duke of York, the king's half-brother, Jasper Tudor, Earl of Pembroke, the Earls of Arundel, Northumberland, Shrewsbury and Wiltshire, Viscounts Beaumont and Bourchier, and twenty-two barons, including Lord Stanley. The Duke of Somerset was not present to take the oath, as he was busy elsewhere, and the Earls of Devonshire, Oxford, and Westmoreland also seem to have been absent.

---

[1] Rolls of Parl., V, 350. Cf. Whethamstede, I, 356.

[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 536, 587; Writs of Privy Seal, file 777; Signed Bills, file 1475, 20th March; Pardon Roll 38 Hen. VI.

[3] Writs of Privy Seal, file 777, 20th Dec.; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 542.

[4] Rolls of Parl., V, 351.

[5] Paston Letters, III, 198.

Parliament was dissolved on 20th December, and a few days later the king went to Leicester to keep Christmas.[1] Not until 21st January were the Yorkists proclaimed in London as attainted traitors.[2] But even before that date their enemies were reaping benefits from their downfall. Remunerative offices left vacant by their attainder, annuities payable out of their forfeited estates, and fines exacted from those who had escaped worse penalties were being distributed among the king's friends with a liberal hand. The Earl of Douglas, the Dukes of Exeter and Buckingham, the Earls of Pembroke, Devonshire, and Shrewsbury, Viscount Beaumont, and Thomas Thorpe were among the beneficiaries. The Earl of Pembroke's father, Owen Tudor, the man who had got himself into trouble years before by marrying Katharine of France, the widow of Henry V and the mother of Henry VI, was also given an annuity of a hundred pounds out of the estates of Lord Clinton; and the nurse of the Prince of Wales was made happy with one of forty marks derived from a lordship which had belonged to the Duke of York.[3]

[1] Rolls of Parl., V, 370; Worcester, 771.

[2] Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 169.

[3] Writs of Privy Seal, file 776, 18th Dec.; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 532, 535; Close Roll 38 Hen. VI, m. 3.

CHAPTER II

THE LORDS OF CALAIS

WHERE were the Duke of York and his confederates hiding while they were being attainted as traitors to their king, and how had they succeeded in eluding their enemies after Trollope's desertion upset their plans and drove them to such sudden and ignominious flight? From Ludford the Yorkist leaders had betaken themselves as quickly and secretly as possible into Wales, but although no one they met seems to have shown a desire to betray them, they had no intention of remaining where they could be so easily pursued. It was evident also that they were too large a party for safety, and there were other reasons why it seemed better for them to separate. Consequently, while York himself, taking with him his son Edmund, as well as Lord Clinton and a few other devoted followers, made his way to Ireland, where he was received, says one who wrote at the time, as if he were the Messiah, crowds of people running to meet him and declaring that they would stand by him even unto death,[1] the Earls of March, Warwick, and Salisbury, accompanied by Sir John Wenlock and two or three other trusted friends, turned their faces in the opposite direction and set out for Warwick's old headquarters at Calais. Guided by a Devonshire gentleman named John Dynham, York's eldest son and his companions soon succeeded in reaching the home of Dynham's widowed mother, and so generous and helpful a hostess did her son's friends find in Joanna Dynham that two years later one of her guests, then newly crowned king of England, granted her the wardship and marriage of a young tenant-in-chief of the crown and sent her eighty pounds in money to be distributed among her tenants and servants because of the good services "which at our last departing out of this our realm towards our town of Calais they did for the safeguard of our person, conduct, and guiding thither in safety."[1] The future Edward IV's debt of gratitude to the Dynhams was indeed great, as it was also John Dynham's money, to the amount of about seventy-three pounds, that purchased the ship in which Edward and his friends, including Dynham himself, finally set sail from Exmouth.[2]

---

[1] Whethamstede, I, 367-368; Nicolas's London Chron., 140; Gregory, 205; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 72. For proof that Clinton went to Ireland with York, see Writs of Privy Seal, file 818, no. 2418.

On their way to Calais the little band of fugitives stopped at the island of Guernsey, which Warwick held in fief of the crown.[3] There they appear to have tarried several days, probably because they were afraid to go on until they heard from Lord Fauconberg, to whose care Warwick had confided Calais when he went over to England.[4] For the actions of Trollope and his men at Ludford did not speak well for the temper of the Calais garrison. Moreover, as the three earls no doubt were aware, about the time Warwick reached Ludlow the captaincy of Calais had again been taken from him, so far as that could be done by means of ink and parchment alone, and again granted to the Duke of Somerset.[5] But if it was news from Fauconberg that the earls were waiting for, any fears they had entertained about the nature of the reception awaiting them at Calais must have been set at rest by what they heard from him, as they soon resumed their voyage and, on 2nd November, were welcomed at Calais with every sign of joy.[6]

So Warwick was safely ensconced in his stronghold once more. But he had come back not a moment too soon, and it remained to be seen if he could hold his own against those who would undoubtedly try again to drive him out. For not only had the king's advisers, anticipating that Warwick, and perhaps the Duke of York himself, would fly to Calais for shelter, sent strict orders, immediately after the disappearance of the Yorkist leaders, that they must not be allowed to enter the place. In order to cut the fugitives off from the mainland as well, in case they should endeavour, on being repulsed from Calais, to land on the English coast, a commission had been issued to Lord Rivers and the sheriff of Kent which, on the ground that the Duke of York and his accomplices were said to be trying to kindle an uprising in Kent, authorized the arraying of the Kentishmen and the seisure of all ships belonging to the Earl of Warwick.[1] More than that, Somerset was getting ready as fast as he could to proceed to Calais to claim the captaincy. On 10th November, when the arrival of the three earls at Calais seems to have been still unknown at Westminster, the treasurer and chamberlains of the Exchequer were directed to provide Somerset and Rivers with money for six weeks' wages for a thousand men and Sir Gervase Clifton, treasurer of Calais, Thomas Thorpe, and John Judde, master of the king's ordnance, with smaller sums for the fitting out of the ships which Somerset would need and for spears and artillery.[2]

---

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 75; Warrants for Issues, I Edw. IV, 3rd Nov. Cf. Fine Roll I Edw. IV, m. 19, and Issue Roll, Mich. I Edw. IV, 7th Nov. Sir John Dynham the elder, father of the John Dynham who figures in Edward IV's reign, married Joanna, daughter of Richard de Arches, and died in 36 Hen. VI. Dugdale, Baronage of Eng., I, 514; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 435. Sir James Ramsey seems to confuse father and son.

[2] Davies' Eng. Chron., 83; Gregory, *ut. sup.*; Fabyan, 635; Kingsford's London Chron., 170; Whethamstede, I, 345.

[3] On Warwick's tenure of Guernsey, see an article by Julien Havet in Bibl. de l'École des Chartres, XXXVII, 183. Jersey and Guernsey, like Warwick's other possessions, were forfeited to the crown by his attainder, and John Nanfan, or Nanfant, of Worcestershire, was made warden and governor of the islands, an office which he had held before, in 1452. Rymer, XI, 453; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 15; French Roll 38 Hen. VI, m. 13 and 24.

[4] Whethamstede, I, 368; Waurin, II, 191.

[5] Rymer, XI, 436.

[6] Fabyan and Kingsford's London Chron., *ut sup.*

If Rivers did not accomplish all that was hoped for, at least he was lucky enough to capture a few of Warwick's ships—great forestage ships, we are told they were—which chanced to be anchored in the harbour of Sandwich. Then Somerset put to sea with the king's letters patent in his pocket and with a force of men which included Lord Roos, Lord Audley (son of the Lord Audley recently killed at Blore Heath), Andrew Trollope, and some if not all of the members of the Calais garrison who had deserted the Yorkists for the king at Ludford.[3] Yet, with all his haste, Somerset was to find that he was a little too late in reaching Calais, just as he had been a little too late in reaching Coleshill a few months before; for when he tried to approach the fortress, to his astonishment and dismay he was greeted with shots from the guns both of the town and of the tower of Rysbank, which stood on guard at the entrance to the harbour. After such a welcome all that he could do, unless he wished to turn about and go back to Sandwich, was to find a footing somewhere near Calais. He proceeded, therefore, to land at Scales' Cliff, near the western end of the English territory, and to advance towards Guines, another fortress which belonged to England and which was almost as carefully guarded as Calais itself. Guines too might have turned him away, but, aware that wages were as much in arrears at Guines as at Calais, the duke won the good-will of the garrison by a promise that all their claims should be paid and then, without further to-do, installed himself in the castle. However, Guines, while well worth having, was not Calais, and it was with a very disappointed and jealous heart that Somerset gazed out across the marshes at the prize, so near and yet so far, which he had coveted so eagerly and so long. Nor was his cup of sorrow yet full. Some of his ships which were bringing over his supplies and a part of his men were either forced by a storm to seek shelter in the harbour of Calais or were deliberately handed over to the Yorkists by the sailors "for good will that they owed unto the Earl of Warwick." Most of the soldiers and sailors who fell into his hands in this manner Warwick disarmed and then suffered to go their way, but a few of them who had been guilty of bad faith towards the earl, probably under Trollope's lead at Ludford, paid for their sins with their heads. On the other hand, one man who seems to have been in one of the captured or surrendered ships and whom Warwick would surely have held as a prisoner if he could, succeeded in escaping. By some means Lord Roos got away to Flanders; from Flanders he returned to England, and not long after he rejoined Somerset in Guines.[1]

---

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 555.

[2] Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, 512.

[3] Davies' Eng. Chron., 84-85; Waurin, II, 199; Paston Letters, III, 234; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 525.

That the Yorkists were still unvanquished, in spite of their flight and attainder, Somerset's sad experience at Calais sufficiently testified. And as the Duke of York had demonstrated on more than one occasion in the past how a momentary defeat might become a stepping-stone to victory, his enemies looked for nothing else than that he would in his own good time emerge from his hiding place to offer them battle again. Before long it was known that the duke was in Ireland instead of in Calais with Warwick, but there was little consolation to be derived from that fact, since it might be taken for granted that he had chosen to go to Ireland not simply because that was the nearest and safest refuge and because on the security of his person so much depended, but because from Ireland he could rally his friends in Wales and western England. On the other hand, Warwick, from the vantage-ground of Calais, would have no difficulty in keeping track of all that happened on both sides of the "narrow sea" and in exchanging messages and concocting plans with the duke's sympathizers in Kent and London. However, it would take time for the Yorkists to make up for what they had lost at Ludford, and the opportunity to strike again did not come to them at once, although Warwick kept busy at Calais and York did not by any means let the grass grow under his feet in Ireland. With the support of the two Geraldine earls, Kildare and Desmond, York succeeded in making himself practically an independent ruler over the English pale in Ireland, and the Anglo-Irish parliament manifested not merely willingness, but eagerness to protect him and to do his bidding. Despite the attainder of the Yorkists by the English parliament, and despite the fact that on 4th December the Earl of Wiltshire, who was also Earl of Ormond and the head of a powerful Irish family, was named lieutenant of Ireland in York's place, the parliament in Ireland continued to recognize the duke as lieutenant, authorized him to set up a mint in his castle of Trim, and ratified his appointment of the Earl of Rutland as chancellor of Ireland.[1] The Anglo-Irish even seized on this opportunity to put forth a sort of declaration of rights. A statute enacted at Dublin under the influence of York's presence declared that Ireland, although subject to England, was "corporate de luy mesme," that she was not bound to obey any English law which had not been accepted and ratified by the lords and commons of Ireland in their great council or in their parliament, or to heed any writs which were not sealed with the special seal of Ireland, and that hereafter if any officer undertook to put in execution any such writ or any other order coming from England which was prejudicial to the ancient customs and privileges of Ireland, he should forfeit all his possessions in Ireland and be fined a thousand marks. All appeals of treason, it was further decreed, must from now on be tried before the constable and marshal of Ireland and in Ireland, and any person groundlessly accusing another of treason must expect to suffer the penalty of death, even though he could show a royal pardon.[1]

---

[1] Kingsford's London Chron.; Davies' Eng. Chron.; Fabyan; Waurin, II, 199-201. See also Du Clercq, livre IV, c.i, whose story is that Somerset left three ships at Dover which were driven into Calais by a storm, when they tried to join him, that two of these ships were seized by Warwick, and that the mariners of the third, the *Catherine*, which carried about two hundred men, jumped into the small boats and made their way to the town, leaving the soldiers to their fate, as they had declared, "pour le doubte du comte de Werwicq," that they would rather die than land in Calais.

The author of Davies' Eng. Chron. speaks as if the capture of Lord Audley also occurred at this time. But Whethamstede, who gives a more detailed account of that event, places it at a later time. It is worth mentioning, however, that Waurin too says that Audley was taken prisoner when the Duke of Somerset's ship "se vint rendre à Callaix." We learn from one of the Paston Letters that Lord Roos was in Guines in January.

---

[1] Signed Bills, file 1473, 4th Dec. 38 Hen. VI; Gregory, 205; Gilbert, Viceroys of Ireland, 368-369.

That this statute of the Irish parliament was meant to shield the Duke of York from harm was obvious, but another statute went even more openly to the point by enacting that, as long as the duke resided in Ireland, anyone who sought directly or indirectly to compass his death or to incite rebellion against him would thereby lay himself open to attainder just as much as if he had been guilty of high treason against the king himself. Nor was it long before the efficacy of these measures for the duke's protection was put to the test, as one William Overy soon arrived in Ireland as the Earl of Wiltshire's representative with writs for York's arrest. But, unlike York, Wiltshire had not taken the trouble to make himself popular in Ireland when, some years before, he had served, first, as York's deputy and subsequently as lieutenant, and also the Anglo-Irish parliament had not enacted statutes for nothing. Overy was attainted, hanged, drawn, and quartered after being tried before York himself;[2] and as it was out of the question for the king to send an army to Ireland in the present state of his affairs, nothing could be done to punish this daring defiance of his duly appointed lieutenant. If a statement afterwards made by the Yorkists is to be believed, the king's helpless ministers stooped so low as to persuade Henry to send letters to the native Irish giving them "comfort to enter into the conquest of the said land." But if so desperate a step as this was actually taken, it proved worse than useless, as all that the Irish did was to turn the king's letter over to York with expressions of astonishment.[3]

Although, as matters now stood, the feeble efforts of the king and his ministers to drive York out of Ireland could only fail, there was still a chance to spoil the designs of the Yorkists by forcing the Earls of March, Warwick, and Salisbury to surrender themselves and Calais; and this was what Somerset, in spite of his initial mishap, hoped and repeatedly attempted to do. For Somerset had no thought of throwing up the game when he found himself in Guines instead of in Calais. If he had not quite reached his goal, at least he was within sight and sound of it, and with a little more effort, he told himself, he would soon attain it. However, though he fought almost daily battles with the men of Calais and succeeded in killing not a few of them, his own losses were still heavier and much more serious, as the reinforcements he expected from England failed to put in an appearance. If the duke sought and obtained horses, arms, and money from France at this time, as one chronicler asserts, such succour did him little good. His ranks grew ever thinner, while so many friends came flocking over from England to join the Yorkists that any men they lost were quickly replaced.[1] No doubt careful watch was kept at the English ports, but Calais was so easily accessible and could be reached by so many routes that it was impossible to keep men from going there. This does not mean, however, that those who hurried to Calais to offer aid to the Yorkists encountered no difficulties on the way. One John Edirgate, gentleman, setting out for Calais with four hundred marks which he meant to donate to the Yorkist earls, was waylaid on Wingham Heath, near Sandwich, and relieved of his purse—an experience which so intensified the poor gentleman's affection for the Duke of York that, at the time of the second battle of St. Alban's, he took a vow to make a pilgrimage to the Holy Land for the good of the duke's cause and to abstain from eating flesh until his pilgrimage was accomplished.[2]

---

[1] Statute Rolls of the Parl. of Ireland, Reign of Hen. VI, 645-647; Facsimiles of National MSS. of Ireland, Part III, no. 42. Cf. Gilbert, 369.

[2] Gilbert, 370; Statute Rolls, 641-645, 677-679.

[3] Yorkist manifesto, Davies' Eng. Chron., 871.

If Somerset did not receive from home the kind of help he wanted, or as soon as he wanted it, steps of another sort seem to have been taken to assist him, since not long afterward the Yorkists, in addition to asserting that their enemies encouraged the native Irish to attack the Duke of York in Ireland, also accused them of requesting foreign princes not to show favour or kindness to the rebellious earls in Calais. But if such a request as this was made, it availed little or nothing, as foreign trading vessels persisted in going to Calais under protection of safeconducts given by the Earl of Warwick, who, as captain of Calais, which he still claimed to be, exercised the privilege of issuing such passports; and so long as they were able to supply their needs by this means, the earls were not likely to think of surrender. For that matter, even English ships could not be kept away from Calais altogether. An order of the parliament held at Coventry forbade all merchants to carry wool, woolfells, or other merchandise to Calais until the town and castle had been brought under the control of the king's appointed captain, in other words, until they had submitted to Somerset.[1] But how could such a prohibition be enforced when it meant either that English wool merchants would have to be permitted to carry their wool directly to the Flemish markets until new staple arrangements could be devised, or that England must be content to see all her wool trade, except the small portion of it which passed through the Straits of Marrok to the Mediterranean, come to a dead standstill? In fact, it was so inconvenient, if not impossible, for England to cut herself off from Calais even for a few weeks that, immediately after the dissolution of the Coventry parliament, Nicholas Bedford, common sergeant of the staple, was allowed to go thither under the king's safeconduct to transact some business connected with the staple. In March the merchants of the staple were even licensed to make shipments of wool and woolfells from Ipswich to Calais, notwithstanding the Coventry decree, to recover a loan of a thousand pounds which they had made to the king.[2]

---

[1] Gregory, 206; Fabyan, 635; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 71, 168-169 Waurin, II, 201-202.

[2] Writs of Privy Seal, file 805, no. 1758.

These were dark days indeed for the merchants of the staple of Calais, who had every reason to expect that the utmost consideration would be shown for their interests, in as much as the crown was always in debt to them, usually to the extent of thousands of pounds, for the wages of the garrison of Calais. For even if the decree against the shipping of merchandise to Calais was only temporary and not enforced to the letter, it meant great hardship to the staplers. To add to their misfortune, in May the king's council ordered that all wool, woolfells, tin, lead, and other staple wares, and all woollen cloth sent out from the ports of London, Southampton, and Sandwich before Michaelmas should be shipped for the king's profit and by persons appointed by the treasurer of England.[3] Moreover, the crown was not the only taskmaster to whose will the unlucky staplers had to submit. They were between the devil and the deep sea, as the Yorkist lords who were in possession of Calais were as much in need of financial assistance as the king. It was absolutely essential not merely to the success of the three earls' future plans, but to their personal safety that the soldiers of Calais should be kept in a good humour by the payment of their wages; the men who were coming over every day from England must also be paid; and for many other purposes money must be had. The merchants of the staple were the nearest and the easiest source to draw from, and we are told that March and Warwick "shifted with the staple of Calais" for eighteen thousand pounds.[1]

---

[1] No reference to this order is to be found in the Rolls of Parliament, but see a license permitting the merchants of the staple to ship some wool from Ipswich to Calais. French Roll 38 Hen. VI, m. 16, 20th March. Cf. Fabyan, 636, who says that it was ordained that no merchant going to Flanders should "pass or go by Calais" lest he should give aid to the Yorkists.

[2] See French Roll 38 Hen. VI, 28th Dec., and the license just referred to.

[3] Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 600.

There was another quarter to which the Yorkists looked for help, and evidently not altogether in vain. If Philip of Burgundy was one of the foreign princes who received a request from King Henry not to show favour to the Yorkist earls in Calais, he ignored it entirely, for the moment he heard that Warwick had arrived in Calais he entered into communication with him. The marshal of Burgundy and the Seigneur de Lannoy were sent to hold a conference with Warwick at Gravelines, on the edge of the English territory, while Charolais, a Burgundian marshal of arms, spent an entire month, from 5th November till 5th December, at Calais.[2] The result appears to have been that a truce of three months' duration was signed between Philip and the Yorkists. If this truce was not as well kept as it ought to have been, that was not Philip's fault; for when some French ambassadors who came to his court just before Christmas complained to him because he had made a truce with the English contrary to his agreement with the king of France and was allowing the men of Calais to pass back and forth through his dominions into and out of France, where they pillaged and plundered and carried off King Charles's subjects as prisoners, he replied that the truce referred to applied only to the territory near Calais, that he had done his best to guard the frontier in that neighbourhood, and that he himself was as much of a sufferer from the marauders as the king of France.[3]

For Philip of Burgundy's treaty with the Yorkists Henry VI's advisers had only themselves to blame, since they had suffered the commercial treaty between England and Burgundy, which

[1] Fabyan, 635; Hall, 243.

[2] Beaucourt, Hist. de Charles VII, VI, 270, note 3.

[3] Du Clercq, liv. IV, c. ii; Beaucourt, VI, 272-277.

dated back to the year 1439, to expire on the first day of November. On 1st October commissioners had been appointed to treat for a prolongation of the truce, but serious events were happening in England at that moment and evidently these commissioners never crossed the sea, as on 26th November, the truce having expired in the meantime, the same men were empowered to negotiate a new treaty similar in nature to the old one.[1] After the issuance of this second commission, however, there is no further reference to the subject, and it may be concluded that pressure of events, or perhaps the knowledge that Philip was already in league with the Yorkists, again kept the king's ambassadors at home.

Although they failed to take the necessary precautions to keep the Duke of Burgundy from entering into partnership with the Yorkists, the king and his ministers—or, to put it more accurately, Margaret of Anjou and her ministers—were not sitting idle. They were looking after the defences of the kingdom, and they were also fitting out an expedition which, when it was ready, was to carry assistance to Somerset. It was Lord Rivers and Sir Gervase Clifton who were to go to Somerset's relief, and on 10th December orders were given for the mustering of their men near Sandwich. The work assigned to Clifton was to guard and keep the sea against the king's enemies, which meant that he was to see that the Yorkists found no chance to land in England, while Rivers was to proceed *versus partes transmarinas*, in other words to Guines and Calais. At the same time one William Scott was commissioned to go to sea with a couple of hundred men-at-arms to protect Winchelsea and the adjacent coast. Just a little later commissions of array were sent into nearly every county in England and John Judde, master of the king's ordnance, was directed not only to seize all war materials belonging to York, Warwick, and Salisbury, but to see that all the royal ordnance scattered about in the castles, walled towns, and fortresses of the kingdom was in good condition and ready for use.[2]

Again, however, things went wrong. The men and ships which were to accompany Rivers and Clifton were gradually assembled at Sandwich, and a considerable fleet was soon riding at anchor there, although some of the men who answered the king's call certainly did so against their inclination. The town of Lydd, for example, sent its bailiff and others to "speak with" Rivers and Clifton and afterwards dispatched a load of "men's harness" to Sandwich, but all the time the sympathy of the men of Lydd was really with "the lords of Calais."[1] In truth, the whole of Kent still favoured the Yorkists, and as both this fact and the sailors' admiration and affection for Warwick were well known at court, common sense dictated that the fleet collected at Sandwich should be thoroughly guarded and that every care should be taken to hide what was going on there from the sharp eyes peering out from Calais. But common sense seems to have been the quality in which Henry VI's ministers were most lacking, and a catastrophe which befell early one morning proved that they had failed to observe the simplest rules of safety. As there were plenty of Sandwich citizens at his side, Warwick had no trouble in keeping himself informed about all the preparations being made in that port, and when Rivers and Clifton were all but ready to sail, with a swift and masterly stroke he nipped their whole enterprise in the bud. In the early morning hours of 15th January the earl sent that good friend of the Yorkists, John Dynham, out from Calais with a band of his most reliable men, including Richard Clapham of Calais, gentleman, William Elyot of Calais, mercer, and two yeomen, a tailor, a chapman, a merchant, a servant, an apothecary, and a butcher, all late of Sandwich, and between four and five o'clock these doughty warriors landed and took possession of Sandwich. The surprise was so complete that Lord Rivers, his wife, the Dowager Duchess of Bedford, and his son, Sir Anthony Woodville, were seized in their beds and carried off to Calais, and, with the ready connivance of the mariners, all the ships of the fleet, full of men and stores, were also borne off as prey. The only ship not taken was the famous *Grace Dieu*, the largest English built ship of her day and one which had helped Warwick to guard the sea two years before. She had to be left behind because she was disabled in some way and could not be made to go even as far as Calais.[2]

---

[1] Both commissions are entered on French Roll 38 Hen. VI, m. 22. Cf. Schanz, Englische Handelspolitik, II, 575. The treaty with Burgundy had been renewed twice, the last time till 1st Nov., 1459. Rymer, XI, 140.

[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 527, 555-561; Warrants under the Signet, file 1375, 1st Dec.; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 72.

"As for tidings here," wrote William of Worcester in ironic vein, "I send some offhand written to you and others, how the Lord Rivers, Sir Anthony, his son, and others have won Calais by a feeble assault made at Sandwich by Dynham, Squire, with a number of eight hundred men on Tuesday between four and five o'clock in the morning." And a letter from another hand gives a description of the reception accorded to the prisoners upon their arrival at Calais. "As for tidings," wrote one of the Pastons, "my Lord Rivers was brought to Calais and before the lords with eight score torches, and there my Lord of Salisbury rated him, calling him knave's son, that he should be so rude to call him and these other lords traitors, for they shall be found the king's true liegemen when he should be found a traitor, &c. And my Lord of Warwick rated him and said that his father was but a squire and brought up with King Henry the Fifth, and sithen himself made by marriage, and also made lord, and that it was not his part to have such language of lords, being of the king's blood. And my Lord of March rated him in like wise. And Sir Anthony was rated for his language of all three lords in like wise."[1]

---

[1] Hist. MSS. Com., Report 5, app., 522.

[2] Inquisitions Miscellaneous, Chancery, file 317; Paston Letters, III, 203;

The raid on Sandwich and the fleet caused wild alarm among King Henry's ministers and friends. It was assumed that this was a preliminary of an immediate and general invasion of the kingdom by the Yorkists, and if John Dynham could accomplish so much, what would not Warwick himself be able to do when he arrived! A meeting of the king's council was immediately held at Westminster, and as no one could guess just where Warwick might decide to land, orders were sent to the counties of Sussex and Southampton that every man must be ready to come to the king's aid in his best array in case the Earl of Warwick and his accomplices attempted to invade the kingdom, and a commission

---

Fabyan, 635-636; Davies' Eng. Chron., 85; Kingsford's London Chron., 170; Worcester, 771; Gregory, 206; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 72; Whethamstede, I, 369; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 439; Waurin, II, 204-205; Du Clercq, liv. IV, c. iii. Waurin states, incorrectly apparently, that Sir John Wenlock shared in the Sandwich raid.

[1] Paston Letters, III, 203-204. Cf. Waurin, II, 205-206. John de Woodville, or Wydevile, the father of Lord Rivers, was sheriff of Northamptonshire in the reign of Richard II. The son succeeded to that office in 7 Hen. IV and was afterwards one of Henry V's body squires. He was knighted by Henry VI in the fourth year of his reign, served in the French wars, and at one time was intrusted with the command of Calais. In 15 Hen. VI he married, without the king's license, Jacquetta de Luxembourg, widow of the Duke of Bedford. In 26 Hen. VI he was made a baron of the realm with the title of Lord Rivers, and two years later he was elected a knight of the Garter. Dugdale, II, 230-231.

was dispatched to Kent to provide for the protection of Canterbury.[1] Then the chancellor, William Waynflete, Bishop of Winchester, posted to the king, who was still at Leicester,[2] and in a few days the clerks of the Chancery were hastily drawing up more commissions of array. A commission also went to the magistrates of Norwich to arm their citizens and to have men-at-arms and archers in readiness to withstand the Yorkists, and another to the mayor of Canterbury directing him to arm such men as he could rely on, to set watches and *exploratores* within and without the city, to see that the gates were guarded day and night, to require everyone going in or out to state whence he came and whither he was going, and to imprison all who in word or in deed upheld the Earl of Warwick and his friends or said aught that was prejudicial to the king's Majesty.[3]

If the capture of Lord Rivers spread consternation in England, at Guines it caused utter dismay, and a few days after it occurred Lord Roos stole across to England to remind the king of the very dangerous position in which Somerset was placed and to implore him to make a fresh effort to send the duke reinforcements.[4] But though Somerset's need was patent, what could the king do? The fleet, save for the disabled *Grace Dieu*, was gone, Lord Rivers was gone, and the Yorkists might descend on England any day and in any place. Calais was no more precious than the rest of the king's realm, and Somerset at Guines was scarcely in more danger than his friends at Westminster. However, it happened that there was one man who was spoiling for a fight and who was quite ready, provided he was supplied with the necessary money, to take the responsibility of defending the kingdom off the hands of the king's scared and inefficient ministers. "Then arose a knight of Devonshire called Sir Baldwin Fulford and said that, on pain of losing of his head, he would destroy the Earl of Warwick and his navy, if the king would grant him his expenses."[5]

With thankfulness of heart Fulford's offer was accepted. On

---

[1] Patent Rolls 38 Hen. VI, Pt. I, m. 7 dorso (Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 564). Cf. Paston Letters, III, 204-205.

[2] Privy Seals; Paston Letters.

[3] Patent Roll 38 Hen. VI, Pt. I, m. 8 dorso (Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 563); Records of the City of Norwich, I, 405.

[4] Paston Letters, *ut sup.*

[5] Davies' Eng. Chron., 85. Fulford was sheriff of Devonshire at this time. Fine Roll 38 Hen. VI, m. 16.

1st February he and his son Thomas and two other men were empowered to impress ships and mariners,[1] and according to the terms of the indenture he signed with the king, the bold Devonshire knight was to serve at sea for three months with a thousand men and a sufficient number of ships. He was to be paid 2s. a day during the three months, the masters of his ships 6d. a day, and his soldiers 2s. 3d. a week; and the king was also required to supply the necessary gunpowder, bows, arrows, and bowstrings. A thousand pounds of the wage money was to be paid at once, the rest at the end of six weeks; and if the money was not paid at the time specified, Sir Baldwin was to be excused from fulfilling his part of the bargain. Considering the state of the royal coffers, Sir Baldwin's prospects of receiving his money were not over bright, but if the king lived up to his promises, Sir Baldwin was to do his "full devoir and dilligence" in keeping the sea and inflict as much injury on the king's enemies as he possibly could. A quarter of all prizes and prisoners were to be the king's property, and if any rebels or traitors were captured, they too were to be handed over to the king, although Sir Baldwin was to have a thousand pounds for every lord taken and five hundred marks for Sir John Wenlock, Sir James Pickering, and Thomas Colt.[2] So easy is it to count one's game before it is bagged!

At the end of January it was rumoured in London that King Henry was on his way to the city and that he was "rearing the people" as he came. But some weeks were to elapse before London had the pleasure of seeing the king. About the time the news of the capture of Lord Rivers reached him, Henry moved from the monastery at Leicester to the monastery at Northampton, but he remained at Northampton during the first half of February, and it was not until 3rd March that he at last reached Westminster Palace.[3]

Perhaps Henry had lingered along the way because the reports coming from his capital were not altogether pleasant to hear. For it had looked for some time past as if the Londoners were not to be trusted. The fact that Warwick, when on his way to Ludlow, had marched through London unhindered was enough to arouse suspicion concerning the city's loyalty, and an order sent to the magistrates of the city, just before the unfortunate event at Sandwich, to assemble men-at-arms and archers to resist the Yorkists had brought a deputation to Northampton with a query. London wished to be assured that her liberties were not going to be infringed, and it was necessary to dispatch a gracious letter declaring that the king had no intention of doing "anything that be or sow to the breach, diminution, or rupture of your said franchises, privileges, or liberties, or any of them."[1] Still, the hearts of the citizens were not touched, even if the king's letter relieved the anxiety of their sensitive magistrates, and proofs of London's liking for the Yorkists continued to multiply. In February one John Tyllesley, who appears to have been an underling of the Duke of Exeter, made known to the king's council that he had captured one Roger Neville and others, "his fellows," as they were going to the assistance of the Yorkists. Neville was a lawyer of the Temple and probably a kinsman of the Earls of Warwick and Salisbury, and it seems that, at the time he was arrested by Tyllesley, he was starting out with seven or eight companions, vintners and mercers of London, to take a supply of bowstrings and arrows to the earls in Calais. This looked much like further proof of London's disaffection, and while Tyllesley was promptly rewarded for his good deed with a year's safeconduct for a ninety ton merchant ship, his prisoners were even more promptly hanged, drawn, and quartered.[2]

---

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 563.
[2] Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, 512 515.
[3] Paston Letters, III, 205; Privy Seals.

But though there were now more heads on London bridge and more quartered bodies on the city's gates to remind the passer-by of the risk he ran when he was tempted to abet the enemies of the king, who was ever deterred by such an object-lesson? No, it would take more than a few executions to check the capital's disloyal tendencies, and on 12th February a special commission, headed by the Duke of Exeter, the Earl of Wiltshire, and Sir John Fortescue, was appointed to hear and determine treasons, rebellions, and other grave crimes in London and in the county of Middlesex, while the city's magistrates were spurred by fear of consequences or by a lingering sense of duty to place guards at the gates and to raise money for the defence of the city.[3] To terrify London, however, was not enough. There was just as much call to search for traitors in other sections of Henry VI's kingdom. The whole country was under suspicion, and before the discovery of Neville's "false conspired treason" had drawn special attention to conditions in the capital of the realm, not only had further orders been issued for the seizure of the property of the Yorkists in other parts of the kingdom, but commissions had been sent out for the holding of inquests regarding treasons, rebellions, the giving of liveries contrary to the statutes, and other offences in counties where the estates of the Yorkists were situated or where the people were thought to be friendly to them.[1] Yet it was still plain that, no matter what orders and commissions were given, it was going to take a long time to teach Yorkist sympathizers the error of their ways and to restore quiet and order—a longer time than the Yorkist leaders were likely to concede. What happened in one place in Wales brought this fact home. Immediately after the attainder of the Duke of York, the Earl of Pembroke had been made constable of Denbigh Castle, but when he arrived to take possession of the castle, it refused to submit to him and he had to lay siege to it. On 16th February the king informed the chancellor that he had received a letter from his brother, the Earl of Pembroke, asking that money and ordnance should be sent to him in all possible haste to assist him to subdue Denbigh Castle, and that he had written to the treasurer to see that provision was made for the money and ordnance without delay. A few days later bombards and cannon were hurried off to Wales, as well as a commission to raise men to resist the Yorkists for which Pembroke had also begged. Yet even after he had been given this help and, to stimulate him to still greater effort, a grant of all moveable goods belonging to the rebels in Denbigh Castle and a thousand marks from the issues of Denbigh and other lordships in Wales, it took Pembroke until sometime in the spring to make the castle surrender.[2]

---

[1] Sharpe, London and the Kingdom, I, 297-298; Sharpe, Cal. Letter Book K, 402-403.

[2] Writs of Privy Seal, file 778, 24th March; Worcester, 772; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 73. This last chronicle gives Exeter the credit for Neville's capture.

[3] Sharpe, London and the Kingdom, *ut sup.*; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 565.

To the happy surprise of the king's ministers, Dynham's raid on Sandwich was not followed as soon as they expected by a general Yorkist invasion and uprising. The anxious guardians of the kingdom were given several more months in which to complete their preparations for defence, and, having been taught so severe a lesson, they took greater precautions to watch and protect the coast,[1] at the same time that they redoubled their efforts to get Sir Baldwin Fulford's fleet ready to put to sea. In spite of all, however, Fulford's fleet struck a rock. On 15th February orders were given for the payment to Sir Baldwin of the wages named in his indenture with the king, and five hundred pounds were thereupon assigned to him from the customs collected in the ports of Bristol and Southampton.[2] But this was only a part of what he must have, and it was a puzzle to know where the rest of the money was to come from. Parliament had been dissolved only a short time before and no one had had the hardihood to suggest, even to a House of Commons packed with the king's friends, that there was need of money. On 12th February both archbishops were bidden to call together their clergy,[3] but it remained to be seen how obliging the two convocations would be, and even if the clergy consented to let the king have a tenth or more, there would be no returns from their grants for some time to come. On the other hand, nothing was to be expected from the merchants of the staple, as they had advanced a thousand pounds to the king as recently as Michælmas[4] and, in addition to that, were crippled by the order forbidding the shipping of wool to Calais. Nor did the spirit lately displayed by the city of London, the chief centre of England's wealth, tend to encourage the hope that money could be obtained in that quarter. All things considered, consequently, there seemed to be but one thing to do. A general appeal must be made for loans, and, in order to insure a prompt response, the appeal must be baited with fair promises. So the Earl of Wiltshire announced that the king's council had decreed that any persons who would loan any sum of money to the king to be spent in resisting the expected invasion by the Yorkists should receive it back out of the revenues from the property coming into the king's hands by the forfeitures of those recently attainted, out of the profits of wardships, marriages, and vacancies of benefices, or out of the next tenths granted by convocation and the next fifteenths and tenths granted by parliament.[1] To provide for the keeping of the sea, which was to be Fulford's special work, a separate offer was made. Tunnage and poundage had come to be the "recognised provision" for this purpose,[2] and a promise was now given that anyone who would contribute to a loan of forty-five hundred marks (£3,000) for the keeping of the sea should have repayment of what he advanced out of the first money coming in from one half of the subsidy of tunnage and poundage in all the ports of England (the ports of Kingston-upon-Hull and Boston only excepted) after the first day of January last past.[3]

---

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 562, 564-565.

[2] Writs of Privy Seal, file 776, 18th Dec.; Warrants under the Signet, file 1376, 16th Feb.; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 534, 550, 564-565, 574, 604; Rymer, XI, 444.

---

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 605-606, 611.

[2] Warrants for Issues, 38 Hen. VI, 15th Feb. (Stevenson has printed this warrant but with the wrong date); Receipt Roll, Mich. 38 Hen. VI, 22nd Feb.

[3] Close Roll 38 Hen. VI, m. 29 dorso. Both convocations were in session in May, but no grants were made. Wake, State of the Church and Clergy, 373.

[4] French Roll 38 Hen. VI, m. 16.

This appeal for help did not pass unheeded, for bishops and abbots, lords and commoners came forward with loans to the king ranging in amount from six pounds to two hundred pounds. But if it is true, as one chronicle states, that the treasurer, the Earl of Wiltshire, "taxed the sum that every man should leave,"[4] the amount received from the individual contributor must be taken as a measure of what he was supposed to possess rather than as a measure of his affection for the king. And, even with that, the loans received for the purpose of defence on land, at least so far as the Receipt Rolls of the Exchequer tell the tale, amounted to not quite three thousand pounds, while the loans for the keeping of the sea, which were both fewer in number and smaller in amount, aggregated less than six hundred pounds.[5] Even when the Earl of Wiltshire, who had only just secured repayment of three thousand marks expended by the king's order

---

[1] Rymer, XI, 446-448. Cf. Close Roll 38 Hen. VI, m. 12, and Davies' Eng. Chron., 90. The loan from Lord Rugemont-Grey with which both Rymer's document and the entry in the Close Roll are concerned is recorded in the Receipt Roll under the date of 3rd March.

[2] Stubbs, III, 271.

[3] See the provision made on 21st March for the repayment of a loan made by one Thomas Stretton. Close Roll 38 Hen. VI, m. 10. Cf, Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 554; Fine Roll 38 Hen. VI, m. 12; and the warrant printed by Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, 515. Stretton's loan also appears on the Receipt Roll under the date of 3rd March.

[4] Davies' Eng. Chron., *ut sup*.

[5] It is quite probable that the Receipt Rolls do not tell the whole story. Loans were often made to the king in person instead of at the Exchequer of Receipt, the king afterwards ordering the entry of a *mutuum* in the pell "as money delivered to our hands." The records of the kingdom were not too well kept in these days of civil war, and very likely more loans came in than were recorded. The Bishop of Durham let the king have £1028 sometime before the end of March, and yet there is no record of the loan on the Receipt Roll. See Writs of Privy Seal, file 778, 31st March; Close Roll 38 Hen. VI, m. 11; French Roll 38 Hen. VI, m. 19.

" now late in our progress and in especial upon the field against our rebels,"[1] had added—out of the public funds, it should no doubt be understood—two loans, one of more than six hundred and the other of more than nine hundred pounds, the sum total raised for the keeping of the sea fell short by almost a thousand pounds of the amount that had been solicited.

It was probably because money was so scarce at Westminster that little or no progress had been made towards fitting out Fulford's fleet when new alarm was excited by the discovery that Warwick had left Calais and gone to Ireland. More or less communication had been kept up between the Duke of York in Ireland and the three earls in Calais, but the distance was so great that the sending of messages not only consumed much time, but was attended with considerable danger. For example, a London vintner named Thomas Desseforde who undertook to carry some letters from Ireland to Calais was taken prisoner in Flanders and kept " in great duress of imprisonment " at Ostend until Warwick heard of his plight and sent a pursuivant-at-arms to procure his release and then fetch him to Calais.[2] Another time York's messenger might fall into the hands of some hostile Englishman and very precious secrets leak out, and it was probably to avoid this danger, as well as to hasten matters, that Warwick resolved to make a trip to Ireland. Nor did the earl's journey prove a hazardous one. Not a soul attempted to resist or molest him. Seizing such merchant vessels as were unlucky enough to cross his path,[3] the earl passed along the southern shore of England in perfect safety, and, on reaching the Irish coast, found York waiting to receive him. On 16th March York and Warwick sailed into the harbour of Waterford together, with a fleet of twenty-six ships, and the next day, the feast of Ireland's patron saint, they went ashore and were welcomed by the mayor and burgesses of the town with much pomp and ceremony.[4]

The news that Warwick had gone to Ireland, doubtless to make final plans with York for an invasion of England, stirred Henry's ministers to desperate exertions. They resolved that, money or no money, Fulford must be ready to fall upon and destroy the earl, should he try to return to Calais and perhaps take York with him, and, lest one fleet might not suffice to do this, they decided to provide a second one. The Duke of Exeter was as eager as Fulford to win the glory of crushing Warwick, for whom he had felt a very bitter hatred ever since the day in 1457 when he had had to give up to him the keeping of the sea, and either the vehemence of the duke's arguments or the want of a better man obtained for him the command he wished. On 19th March Exeter entered into an agreement with the king by which he bound himself to keep the sea with at least thirty-five hundred men for three years, while the king promised to set aside for his use that half of the income from tunnage and poundage which had not already been pledged to those who had responded to the council's request for loans.[1] After this ships were requisitioned and victualled as rapidly as possible and the officers of the Exchequer were commanded to pay over to Exeter twenty-five hundred marks, and to Fulford two thousand marks, as the money from the loans came in. The king also granted the *Grace Dieu*, which was still lying at Sandwich, to Exeter, and she was soon being made ready for service. A Venetian carrack which happened to be in the Thames was obtained for a hundred pounds a month, and three Genoese carracks were hired at Sandwich for the same price.[2] It was even hoped that the great Venetian merchant fleet, the Flanders galleys, could be drawn into the king's service, but as the masters of the galleys had neither the authority nor the desire to help to fight the king of England's battles, they made haste to hoist their sails and depart—a proceeding which so enraged the king's ministers that they threw all the Venetian merchants living in London into prison and refused to set them at liberty until they had given security to the amount of thirty-six thousand ducats.[3] Henry VI's ministers displayed strange stupidity on many occasions, but it is doubtful if they ever did a stupider thing than to imprison the Venetian merchants, seeing that all the foreign merchants in London immediately took fright and began to pray for the success of the Duke of York.

---

[1] Warrants for Issues, 38 Hen. VI, 18th Feb.

[2] See a grant made to Desseforde on 12th April, 1464. Writs of Privy Seal, file 802, no. 1650.

[3] Early Chancery Proceedings, bundle 27, nos. 383, 440, 471.

[4] Worcester, 772; Paston Letters, I, 186. Waurin (II, 209) says that Warwick's reception in Ireland was " moult grande, selon la mode du saulvage pays."

---

[1] Writs of Privy Seal, file 778, 24th March; French Roll 38 Hen. VI, m. 5; Fine Roll 38 Hen. VI, m. 12; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 554; Rymer XI, 451.

[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 566-567, 577, 602, 605; Rymer XI, 448; Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, 515-517; Writs of Privy Seal, *ut sup.*

[3] Cal. Venetian State Papers, I, 88.

By the third week in April Exeter and Fulford were ready, after a fashion, to put to sea. But Warwick had not yet seen fit to leave Ireland, and as long as he chose to stay there all that the king's admirals could do was to watch and wait, stop any fishing boats proposing to go to Ireland, as Fulford's commission specially empowered him to do, and perhaps capture a few of the pirates who were lying in wait about the coast in the hope of overhauling some richly laden merchant vessel and who had just been plying their nefarious trade with unusual success off the Essex and Suffolk coast.[1] However, while an attack on Warwick in Ireland was not to be thought of and Exeter and Fulford were kept waiting in suspense for weeks, the earl's long stay in Ireland filled one man's heart with fresh hope. Warwick's absence from Calais seemed to be the Duke of Somerset's great opportunity. But unfortunately Somerset, like everyone else, was handicapped by lack of money. The more than five thousand pounds in wages which had been owing to the garrison of Guines in January of this year had not yet been paid, in spite of the promise the duke had given when he was admitted to the castle,[2] and, except for some rewards prudently distributed among them, the duke's own men were not faring much better than the garrison. Upon Andrew Trollope, to compensate him for the loss of the property he had owned in Calais, was bestowed the office of bailiff of the town and marches of Guines; to Thomas Tunstall, another of Somerset's men, was given an annuity of forty pounds to be taken from the lordships of Mark and Oye, which had formerly been granted to Louis Galet but had now been forfeited by him because he had joined the king's rebels in Calais; to John Ormond was granted a ship and its contents once belonging to Lord Duras, who had also joined the rebels in Calais; and to John Turnbull, apparently one of the men who had deserted Warwick at Ludford and afterwards followed Somerset to Guines, was promised the tolls on the causeway between Calais and Guines.[3] But Somerset could not procure grants such as these for all his friends, and there was no ready money. Even Somerset himself had not received his wages, and Lord Roos, who had been in the Duke's service with a force of men-at-arms and archers ever since the duke first went to Guines, was "behind unpaid a great sum of money."[1]

---

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 602, 605; Rymer XI, 450.

[2] See a license to Nicholas Huse, or Husey, lieutenant of Guines, to export wool to pay off a part of this debt. French Roll 38 Hen. VI, m. 2, 20th June.

[3] Writs of Privy Seal, file 777, 10th and 23rd Feb., 12th March; French Roll 38 Hen. VI, m. 16; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 553, 574, 585. According to Waurin, Lord Duras had served as admiral of the fleet which took Warwick to Ireland. Duras was a Gascon by birth, but he delivered

The importance of sending money and reinforcements to Somerset immediately, so that he could take advantage of Warwick's absence to capture Calais, was fully appreciated at Westminster, and on 16th March the officers of the Exchequer were ordered to pay Lord Roos two hundred pounds and on the following day to hand over to some of Somerset's servants, whom the king was sending to Guines, two hundred marks for part payment of the fees and wages to which the duke was entitled as captain of Calais.[2] But sums like these were hardly more than a drop in the bucket, and although Lord Audley and Humphrey Stafford of Southwick were dispatched with some sort of aid for Guines, they encountered such bad weather that, to save themselves from shipwreck, they had to land at Calais, where they were forthwith thrust into prison. Worse still, Somerset made an attack and came to grief. Determined to take Calais before Warwick returned, whatever happened, on 23rd April the duke called his soldiers together and marched out across the causeway. But he did not get far, for near Newnham bridge, a strongly fortified bridge on the only road running across the marshes from Boulogne, the Yorkists came out to meet him, drove him back, and slew many of his men. With this he was reduced to helplessness again.[3]

During the weeks of Warwick's sojourn in Ireland, when all signs again pointed to a Yorkist invasion in the near future, England began to hear of a further danger. A report began to circulate that not only the Yorkists, but her ancient enemies, the French, were preparing to attack her. The Duke of Norfolk was sent home to keep Easter at Caister Castle "for safeguard of the country against Warwick and other such of the king's enemies which may lightly by likeliness arrive at Waxham," as Friar Brackley, a friend of the Pastons, expressed it; and a little later some other acquaintances of the Pastons were called upon to see

---

Bordeaux to the English in October, 1452, and after Guienne was reconquered by the French he emigrated to England. Commynes' Mémoires, I, 200, note 1. See Chastellain's interesting apostrophe to him, V, 488-489.

[1] Warrants for Issues, 38 Hen. VI, 16th March.

[2] *Ibid.*, 16th and 17th March.

[3] Whethamstede, I, 369-370; Worcester, 772.

that the watches on the Norfolk coast were not neglected, as not only the Duke of York and his confederates, but the king's adversaries in foreign lands were plotting to invade the realm. The mayors of Winchelsea and Southampton were also instructed to arm their citizens, to guard their gates, and to take all other precautions necessary for safety, because, they were told, it had been learned that the king of France, as well as the Duke of York and the Earls of Warwick and Salisbury, were planning to seize their towns.[1]

If Charles VII had had the power and the will to send an army against England at this moment, the proud island kingdom which still blushed with shame at the memory of the pillaging of Sandwich by Frenchmen three years before would certainly have found herself in grave danger. For not only were Henry VI's resources almost exhausted but, what was worse, every day he had more reason to question the loyalty of his subjects. Almost at the moment that London was listening to a proclamation forbidding any "congregation, conventicle, assembly, insurrection, rout, riot, or rumor" to be made to the disturbance of the king's peace, on pain of forfeiture of all the liberties and franchises of the city and of the seizure of the persons and goods of the magistrates and citizens—a proclamation which would never have been made on slight provocation—John Judde was murdered a little way beyond St. Albans while he was carrying some ordnance to the king in fulfilment of the commission given to him in December.[2] But happily the rumoured French invasion seems to have been only an invention of the government by which it was hoped to start the story that the Yorkists had entered into an alliance with England's most detested foe. Margaret of Anjou herself had been thought to be guilty of a league with the French, and having learned by painful experience what disastrous consequences such a suspicion could lead to, she was probably attempting to ruin her enemies by pinning the same suspicion to them.

At the time of Judde's murder more men were being mustered at Sandwich for the Duke of Exeter, and before the end of May a new relief expedition was getting ready to go to Guines. On 23rd May the king's council appointed Osbert Mountfort, a veteran of the French wars and an old officer of Calais,[1] and one John Baker to take two hundred men-at-arms and archers to Guines to assist the Duke of Somerset, and at the same time Thomas Thorpe, Sir Thomas Kyriell, and others were ordered to conduct the muster of the men.[2] But not many days later came word that Warwick had at last left Ireland. The long consultation with York was over, and late in May, taking with him his mother, who had fled to Ireland for safety, the earl set out on his return voyage to Calais. This time he did not pass wholly unchallenged, as Exeter and Fulford were on the lookout for him. The scanty funds of his enemies, however, had been used up during their long wait, and although Exeter hurried away from Sandwich in the *Grace Dieu*, at Dartmouth his men mutinied for lack of money and food and when, about the first of June, he sighted Warwick's ships off the Cornish coast, he dared not attack them, although he had the larger fleet. Warwick was ready for a fight, if Exeter showed a wish for one, but either because he was ignorant of the state of mind of the duke's men or because he shrank from showing open disrespect to the king's flag, he did not force a battle. When he saw that Exeter meant to keep at a safe distance, he passed on quietly to Calais. The earl's voyage to Ireland and back had been made without the loss of a ship or a man, and, far from crushing him whom they had gone forth to seek, Exeter's efforts had "turned to naught," while Fulford, after consuming all the money that had been given to him, merely "went home again."[3]

---

[1] Paston Letters, III, 212; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 602, 609.

[2] London Journal 6, f. 158; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 73; Flenley's Six Town Chron., 149. Judde is said to have been "a Breton born."

Warwick's safe return from Ireland was a bitter pill indeed for Somerset, who, even after his defeat at Newnham bridge, had clung to the hope that some turn of the wheel of fortune would enable him to get into Calais before his rival reappeared. On 5th June, when it was probably believed that Warwick and his fleet would be annihilated by Exeter and Fulford and that the Yorkist rebellion would thereupon collapse, Somerset had been given power to grant a pardon to all the rebels in Calais, with the exception of Lord Fauconberg, John Dynham, Richard Whetehill, formerly mayor and at this time comptroller of Calais, Louis

---

[1] Mountfort had been treasurer of Normandy, *bailli-général* of the county of Maine, and captain of Le Mans under the English. Paston Letters, III, 140; Stevenson, Letters and Papers, index.

[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 607-609.

[3] Davies' Eng. Chron., 85; Kingsford's London Chron., 171; Worcester, 772; Fabyan, 636; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 72; Waurin, II, 210-211.

Galet, and a few others;[1] but of this authority he never had a chance to make use. Warwick had escaped his enemies and now, immediately after his return to Calais, was about to deal the final blow to Somerset's hopes. When Osbert Mountfort's relief expedition was ready to leave Sandwich for Guines and was only waiting for a favourable wind, history almost repeated itself; for at that moment John Dynham, Sir John Wenlock, and Lord Fauconberg crossed over from Calais, attacked Sandwich from land and sea, and, after a hard fight in which many of Mountfort's men were killed and Dynham was so badly wounded in the leg that he limped ever after, captured Mountfort and the town. Then, while Fauconberg remained at Sandwich, a foothold on the mainland which this time the Yorkists meant to keep, Dynham carried Mountfort off to Calais, just as a few months before he had carried off Lord Rivers and his wife and son.[2]

This second catastrophe at Sandwich, so closely resembling the first, was too much for Somerset's long-tried courage, and it is stated that, overlooking the fact that the castle was not his to give, he offered to surrender Guines to Philip of Burgundy's son, Charles, Count of Charolais, with whom he had struck up a friendship during these days when he had been a near neighbour of Burgundy. But though Charles himself would have been delighted to accept the duke's offer, his wiser and more cautious father, in spite of the fact that he had long coveted and in 1436 had even attempted to seize Calais and the county of Guines, which, as Count of Artois, he claimed as a fief, refused his consent for fear of getting into trouble with the king of England.[3] Guines did not change hands, consequently, but time was to show that the Duke of Somerset was not the only person near the throne of Henry VI who felt at liberty to give away the possessions of the English crown.

To Henry's ministers not less than to Somerset the failure of Exeter and Fulford to destroy Warwick and his fleet was a terrible blow, and yet, with their usual fatuity, they hastened to make a bad matter worse. They issued fierce proclamations stating that any person who aided or abetted the Duke of York, the Earls of March, Warwick, and Salisbury, or any other person who had been attainted by the parliament held at Coventry, would be treated as a rebel; and in many counties the search for traitors was resumed.[1] If the Yorkist lords in Ireland and Calais were beyond reach, their friends in England were not, and this renewed attempt to exterminate Yorkist supporters was carried out with great harshness, particularly at the little Berkshire town of Newbury, which belonged to the Duke of York but was now in the custody of the Earl of Pembroke.[2] It was the Earl of Wiltshire, Lord Scales, and Lord Hungerford who conducted the inquest at Newbury, and not only did they confiscate all the property in the town, but they sent a number of the inhabitants to the gallows to be hanged, drawn, and quartered and others to Wallingford to be imprisoned there in the castle jail.[3] But terrorism, as usual, defeated its own end. The events at Newbury helped not a little to prepare the soil for the Yorkist seed, as fear and resentment caused Henry VI's subjects to listen with increasing eagerness to the promises held out by the exiles. The Yorkists had sent letters to many places in England declaring that their only object was to cure the kingdom's sufferings,[4] and they now issued another manifesto, which had probably been drawn up by York and Warwick in Ireland and for which the manifesto put forth by Warwick when he was on his way to Ludlow had evidently served as a rough draft.

---

[1] Rymer, XI, 454; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 173; Exchequer Accounts, France, bundle 195.

[2] Davies' Eng. Chron., Kingsford's London Chron., Fabyan, and Worcester, *ut sup.*; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 73; Whethamstede, I, 371.

[3] Waurin, II, 215; Chastellain, IV, 68; Du Clercq, livre IV, c. xxxviii.

In this new manifesto, in which the name of the Earl of March appears by the side of those of York, Warwick, and Salisbury, the Yorkists once again endeavoured to justify what they had done and what they were about to do by an exposition of the kingdom's wrongs. And they did not mince their words. God's Church and His ministers, they asserted, were suffering from oppression, extortion, even robbery and murder; as the king's livelihood had been given away to others, his purveyors had taken to robbing his people in order to meet the expenses of his household; the laws of the realm were so badly kept that justice had vanished from the land; the people had been impoverished by heavy taxes, and most of the money extorted from them had gone into the pockets of men who were really their enemies and who had permitted the king's possessions in France to be "shamefully lost or stolen;" the same iniquitous persons had now begun to levy a new imposition on the people which "never afore was seen," namely, the conscription of men, after the French manner, for the king's guard; and lastly, certain lords had caused the king to send letters under his privy seal both to his Irish enemies, a thing no king of England had ever done before, by which the Irish were given "comfort to enter into the conquest of the said land," and to his enemies in other lands, asking them to show no favour to the town of Calais and thereby giving them "comfort enough to proceed to the winning thereof." Indeed, it was to be feared that, if they had the opportunity, the same lords would hand over England itself to the king's enemies.

---

[1] Rymer, XI, 454; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 613-614.
[2] Fine Roll 38 Hen. VI, m. 6.
[3] Davies' Eng. Chron., 90; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 648-649.
[4] Gregory, 206.

Yet it was not the general grievances of the kingdom alone which the Yorkists desired to air. Their own personal sufferings had driven them to their present course of action, and they took pains not only to state what those grievances were, but to call attention once more to the quality of the blood which coursed through the Duke of York's veins and which made any attack upon him and the sons derived from his loins a doubly heinous crime. Since the murder of the Duke of Gloucester at Bury, they went on to say in their manifesto, their enemies had sought continually to destroy the Duke of York and the issue God had given him "of the royal blood," as well as the Earls of Warwick and Salisbury—and this for no other reason whatever than the "true heart" which the duke and the earls bore to the king and his people. They declared that they had been shut out of the king's presence by the Earls of Shrewsbury and Wiltshire and Lord Beaumont, who for a long time past had controlled the king's affairs and who were afraid of finding themselves charged with the misery of the kingdom, as, indeed, they deserved to be, since it was in truth they, and not the king, "which is himself as noble, as virtuous, as rightwise and blessed of dispositions as any prince earthly," who were responsible for all that was wrong. The Yorkists claimed also that the real reason why they had been attainted was that those same self-seeking lords, not satisfied with having got possession of the king's lands and goods, wanted to lay hands on their property as well. Finally, they brought their diatribe against the king's ministers to an end with another loyal flourish which was meant to be an adroit reply to one of the lies their enemies had told about them. They had heard, they said, that the French king was making "great assembly" of his people, and it was because this was alarming for many reasons that they wanted to come to the king to acquaint him with all the above "mischiefs" and to implore him to have pity and compassion on his oppressed people.[1]

It has been said that in this Yorkist manifesto of 1460 are comprised "many points which are mere constitutional generalities, statements that have no special reference to the circumstances of the times, and charges which had been from time immemorial part of the stores of political warfare."[2] This may be true, but it is also true that the manifesto contains no statement not applicable to the moment at which it was issued, although in some of their accusations the Yorkists were doubtless guilty of considerable exaggeration. The clergy had been required to make loans to the king in addition to the many grants they conceded in convocation, and no doubt they, as well as the laity, had suffered through the restlessness and disorder prevailing in the kingdom; but Henry VI was a very devout Christian, and the first article of the manifesto leaves an impression of greater wrongs done to the Church than he, weak as he was, was likely to tolerate. Again, even if the Irish had actually been invited to make trouble for the Duke of York, and even if foreign princes had been asked to have no dealings with Yorkist Calais and Somerset had offered Guines to the Count of Charolais, the insinuation that the king's ministers were ready to hand over England itself to the king's enemies was, we must think, unjust. On the other hand, it was undeniably true that the king had been greatly impoverished and that in consequence the hated right of purveyance had been badly abused. There was just as abundant justification for the complaint that the people's money had been wasted and that the king's inheritance in France had been shamefully lost. Lastly, if the measures recently adopted for the defence of the kingdom did not fully warrant the inference that the French method of conscription was about to be introduced into England, the fact remains that in the commissions of array sent into almost every county in December, 1457, and also in those issued immediately after the dissolution of the Coventry parliament, there had appeared a clause which empowered the commissioners to demand that every village, township, and hamlet, according to its population and wealth and as soon and as often as commanded, should provide the king with a certain number of able-bodied men and archers at its own expense for the defence of the realm against the Yorkists.[1]

---

[1] Davies' Eng. Chron., 86-90.

[2] Stubbs, Cons. Hist. of Eng., III, 187-188.

On the whole, therefore, allowing for some over-statements, the charges the Yorkists brought against Henry's ministers were well founded. Whether they themselves, if the government came into their hands, would succeed in setting the kingdom to rights was, of course, another question; but certainly the number of the king's subjects who looked to them for political and economic salvation was growing apace. From the moment Sandwich was taken by the Yorkists, many persons hurried to join Lord Fauconberg there, and not only were assurances sent to the earls at Calais that if they would come over to England and would keep "true promise" by attempting nothing against the king's person or honour, they could count on a hearty welcome and ample support,[2] but the Kentishmen brought out the proclamation used by Jack Cade ten years before and, after cutting out of it some articles no longer serving their purpose, issued it anew.[3] In addition, a ballad which made its appearance on the gates of Canterbury voiced in its own way, and with unmistakable frankness, the desire of the people to see the Yorkist lords come home and assume by force of arms, since other means had failed, the guidance of the kingdom's fortunes.

---

[1] The clause in the commissions of December, 1459, runs as follows: "Et insuper assignavimus vos conjunctim et divisim ad limittandum, assignandum, et taxandum cujuslibet ville, villate, et hamlette, tam infra libertates quam extra, juxta ratam hominum in eadem villa, villata, siue hameletta habitancium ac juxta ratam possessionum et bonorum suorum ad certum competentem numerum potenciorum hominum et sagittariorum in quorum fidelitatibus specialiter confiditis qui circa personam nostram et alibi ad mandatum nostrum in defensionem et resistenciam predictas ad custus et expensas earundem villarum, villatarum, et hamelettarum, quamcito et tociens quociens ex parte nostra premuniti fuerint venient et intendent et ad nos in consilio nostro de numero hujusmodi hominum et sagittariorum sub sigillis vestris infra tres septimanas proximas post recepcionem presencium debite certificandi." Patent Roll 38 Hen. VI, part 1, m. 15 dorso.

[2] Whethamstede, I, 371; Gregory, 206.

[3] This seems to be the best explanation of the two titles of the manifesto in Lambeth MS. 306 (see Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 94, note) and of the differences between that manifesto and another, also in John Stow's handwriting, which is preserved in Harleian MS. 543, f. 165a, and the title of which is, "1460. Articles of the comons of Kent at ye coming of therle of March, Warwike, and Sarum with ye lords Fauconbrigs & Wenloke from Calies to the battayle at Northampton." A summary of these articles will be found in Chronicles of the White Rose of York, lxxiv. In his Annales Stow says

"Send hom, most gracious Lord Jhesu most benygne,
Sende hoom thy trew blode vnto his propre veyne,
Richard, duk of York, Job thy seruaunt insygne,
Whom Sathan not cesethe to sette at care and dysdeyne,
But by The preserued he may nat be slayne;
Sette hym *ut sedeat in principibus*, as he dyd before,
And so to oure newe songe, Lorde, thyn erys inclyne,
Gloria, laus et honor Tibi sit Rex Christe Redemptor!

"Edwarde, Erle of Marche, whos fame the erthe shalle sprede,
Richard, Erle of Salisbury, named prudence,
Wythe that noble knyghte and floure of manhode,
Richarde, erle of Warrewyk, sheelde of oure defence,
Also lytelle Fauconbrege, a knyghte of grete reuerence;
Jhesu ham restore to thayre honoure as thay had before,
And euer shalle we syng to thyn Hyghe Excellence,
Gloria, laus et honor Tibi sit Rex Christe Redemptor!"[1]

But neither manifestoes nor ballads touched the callous hearts of the king's ministers. On the contrary, the reply sent back from Westminster was a commission for a general inquest in Kent, Surrey, Sussex, Middlesex, Essex, and Hertfordshire on which appeared the names of the hated executioners of Newbury, Wiltshire, Hungerford, and Scales.[2] However, from one of this trio the Yorkists and their friends had nothing more to fear. Alarmed, evidently, by the storm of wrath his deeds had helped to raise, the Earl of Wiltshire had gone down to Southampton, after the cruel work at Newbury was finished, and there, "under colour for to take the Earl of Warwick but specially for to steal privily out of the realm, as it proved afterwards," had armed and victualled five Genoese carracks. With this tiny fleet the earl cruised about for some time, but all the while he dreaded, says the chronicler, the coming of the Yorkists earls, and in the end he took refuge in "Dutchland" and sent his soldiers back to England[3]—a step which proved his discretion, if also his pusillanimity. For by this time the Kentishmen had risen once more and "the lords of Calais" were at hand.

---

that the people of Kent and the adjoining counties resorted to Lord Fauconberg in great numbers and "made long proclamations containing divers articles and causes of their assembly."

[1] Davies' Eng. Chron., 91-94.

[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 613.

[3] Davies' Eng. Chron., 90; Flenley's Six Town Chron., 152; Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 28.

CHAPTER III

THE LORDS OF CALAIS INVADE ENGLAND

A FEW days after the capture of Osbert Mountfort at Sandwich there arrived at Calais an Italian ecclesiastic who had already spent more than a year at the court of Henry VI and who was destined to play a curious and important part in the momentous events about to take place in Henry's kingdom. It was in January, 1459, that Francesco Coppini, Bishop of Terni, had been sent to England for the first time by the then newly elected pope, Pius II (Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini).[1] Pius, in the belief that at a call from him the kings and princes of Christendom would gladly abandon their quarrels and unite in a universal crusade against the Turks, had convoked a diet of princes to meet at Mantua in June of that year and had charged Coppini with the task of seeing that the king of England sent representatives to the diet. All was not quite so easy, however, as Pius imagined it was going to be, as selfish greed and petty spites are not readily cast aside at the bidding of one man, even when that man is the head of the Christian Church. King Henry did not fail to listen with all due respect and attention to the papal message, and not long after Coppini's arrival he called the great council together to decide what answer he should make; but, owing to the state of things in England, then already on the verge of civil war, it was the middle of May, 1459, before delegates to the diet were appointed.[2] During the weeks of delay Coppini went over to France, and while he was there, paid Charles VII twenty pounds for a safeconduct for the English ambassadors who were going to Mantua.[3] But at the end of May he came back to England and, after spending a few days at Canterbury, proceeded to London, where he found life very enjoyable, as he was hospitably entertained by many of the greatest nobles and prelates of the land. Somewhat later he set out for Coventry, where the king was then staying, and on the way he paid a day's visit to Abbot Whethamstede at St. Albans, a lucky chance to which we are indebted for a brief but graphic pen-portrait of the man. The chronicler of St. Albans took enough interest in the Pope's ambassador to record that he was short of stature and very small, in fact, not particularly remarkable in appearance in any way, but gifted with much liveliness of spirit and with such wonderful eloquence and fluency of speech that his words seemed to drop from his lips like dew.[1] Later events were to show that the wily Italian possessed a good deal more eloquence than discretion, not to say a good deal more self-conceit than Christian humility.

---

[1] Gobellinus, Pii Secundi Pontificis Max. Commentarii, 89; Rymer, XI, 419.

[2] Privy Council Proceedings, VI, 298-299; Rymer, XI, 422.

[3] Warrants for Issues, 38 Hen. VI, 21st March.

After Coppini's return from France some alterations were made in the personnel of the embassy appointed to go to Mantua, and by the end of July matters had gone so far that the officers of the Exchequer were ordered to pay the wages of the ambassadors.[2] Nevertheless, when the diet met, at the end of September instead of in June, the only representatives of the king of England who presented themselves were a couple of priests of no special renown or prestige, and Pius II, deaf to all explanations, resented deeply what he regarded as proof of England's lack of respect for the Holy See.[3] Even the battle of Blore Heath, where Lord Dudley, one of the men who were to have been Henry's spokesmen at Mantua, was taken prisoner, was not considered a sufficient excuse for the failure of the king of England to respond in the expected manner to a request made by the supreme head of the Church. In spite of his indignation, however, Pius did not recall Coppini, who not only stayed on in England, but in December was given the powers of a legate *de latere*, apparently in the hope that this augmentation of his authority would make it possible for him to check the civil war which was now in full swing in England.[4] After this the legate did make some effort to bring back peace to England by urging that the Yorkist lords should be invited to meet their opponents in a friendly conference, but his interference only antagonized the king's adherents. Since he found that he was not going to be allowed to exercise his legatine office, late in the spring of 1460 he indignantly shook the dust of England from his feet and departed for the continent.[1]

---

[1] Whethamstede, I, 331-332; Chron. of John Stone, 77. The St. Albans chronicler writes as if this were Coppini's first arrival in England, but that was not the case.

[2] Privy Council Proceedings, VI, 302.

[3] Gobellinus says that Henry "episcopos et proceres regni præclaros designavit oratores, et nemo illorum iter ingressus est, contempserunt omnes regis jussionem." But the St. Albans chronicler tells quite a different story.

[4] If Coppini's commission did not actually empower him to interfere in England's political affairs, it certainly did so by implication, as he was sent there "ad imploranda contra Turcas auxilia placandumque gentem." See Pius's letter to Coppini in Theiner, Vetera Monumenta Hibernorum et Scotorum, 423, and Gobellinus, 277-278. Cf. Davies' Eng. Chron., 94, where

The failure of Coppini's attempt to settle England's troubles was probably due in part to the determination of Margaret of Anjou and her coterie to crush the Yorkist malcontents once for all instead of patching matters up with them, but also in part to a suspicion which had crept into the minds of many people that the legate, although pretending to be impartial, had a secret understanding with the Yorkists. And there was good ground for such a suspicion. For if Coppini had not come to England with a definite political program already mapped out, by this time, probably with the help of others, he had formed one which, as nearly as can be determined at this distance of time, amounted to this: the Pope was to strengthen his authority still further by bestowing on him the cardinal's hat, and when this had been secured, the new cardinal was to throw all his influence on the side of the Yorkist lords, who, after being raised to power through his aid, would show their gratitude for what had been done for them by sending an expedition against Normandy and Gascony.[2] To this scheme Philip of Burgundy was either privy from the first or in time became so, and so was Charles VII's son, the Dauphin Louis, who, after a violent quarrel with his father, had fled to

---

it is said that the legate "had authority by the Pope's bulls for to entreat peace between the king and the earls if need were; but how it were, he usurped and took upon him more power than he had, as it was known afterward." This may be regarded as the view which the Yorkists themselves ultimately took of the matter.

[1] Gobellinus, 89. It may have been in part to make some explanation to Pius that John Lax was sent to Rome a little later. By the king's order Ralph Josselyn, alderman of London, paid £200 to Lax "for certain things to be purchased of our holy father the Pope concerning the surety and increase of our mother holy Church and the weal and supportation of Christ's faith." Signed Bills, file 1476, 29th May, 38 Hen. VI. Lax was in Milan, on his way to Rome, at the beginning of May, and after reaching Rome he seems to have remained there nearly two years. In the meantime he was attainted of treason by Edward IV's first parliament, but the Pope intervened in his behalf, and in the end he was pardoned. Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 22, 35, 107; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 387; Early Chancery Proceedings, bundle 31, no. 477.

[2] On Coppini's policy in England, see Cal. Milanese Papers, I, ix-x, and the letters printed in that volume and in Cal. Venetian Papers, I.

Philip's court. But the original conceivers of it seem to have been Coppini and Francesco Sforza, Duke of Milan, who kept up a lively correspondence with the legate while he was in England and exerted his influence to the utmost to obtain from Pius II the token of authority Coppini so much desired. Coppini's chief object throughout, it is to be feared, was self-aggrandizement. He wanted to wear the cardinal's hat and cut a mighty figure in the world. What Sforza was seeking, on the other hand, was to force Charles VII to withold his support from the Angevin candidate to the throne of Naples, John of Calabria. As for the Yorkists, although John of Calabria was the brother of Margaret of Anjou and therefore no friend of theirs, it was certainly not for the sake of Sforza's ally, Ferdinand of Naples, that they were ready to listen to Coppini. Nor was it only because the presence of a papal legate in their ranks was an appreciable addition to their strength, as they knew their opponents too well to hope for the peaceful victory which Coppini talked about. They were attracted by the legate's plan mainly because they hoped it would give them an opportunity to form an alliance with Philip of Burgundy, with whom they were already on good terms, with the Dauphin Louis, and with the Duke of Milan. Such an alliance as this would not only be valuable at the moment, but would enable the Duke of York, after he had won his way back to power in England, to accomplish that renewal of the war with France which he had always ardently desired and which, if carried out with any degree of success, would strengthen his position at home as nothing else could.

It was really by the advice of the Earl of Warwick that Coppini left England in the spring of 1460,[1] and, after crossing the sea, he went to Bruges. But communication between Bruges and Calais was frequent and easy, and the legate had not been long in Bruges before he received letters from the three Yorkist earls requesting him, as he afterwards claimed in a letter he wrote to Henry VI, "to interpose to restore peace and terminate civil discord" in England. Other letters followed, according to his story, which intimated the readiness of the earls to accept suitable conditions of peace, and he decided, therefore, to go to Calais, although before doing so he took the precaution of sending copies of the earls' letters to King Henry and the chancellor of England and of asking

---

[1] So he himself stated. Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 21.

Henry to let him come to him and explain what terms of peace he had to offer. On arriving at Calais, however, he found everything in turmoil and the Yorkists all ready to cross to England, and as the earls declared they were unable to wait longer, all that he could do was to exhort them to keep the peace and be obedient. Thereupon they gave him a written pledge that they would do all in their power to preserve and promote the honour of the king and the welfare of the realm, and declared that they had no other wish than to present themselves before the king and try to recover the position and favour which their enemies had taken from them. They even begged the legate to cross the sea with them in order to help to prevent bloodshed, and they promised that they would do anything honourable and just of which he approved. Finally, they gave him certain documents under their seals, which Coppini assured King Henry would certainly meet with his approval, if only he would receive them "with a tranquil and open mind."[1]

The documents which the Yorkist earls gave to Coppini at Calais, and which he commended to King Henry's consideration, consisted of some Latin articles. These had been drawn up on 25th June by March, Warwick, Salisbury, and Fauconberg and were addressed to the legate himself, who was promised by the authors that they would persuade the Duke of York also to accept them. But, notwithstanding Coppini's description of these articles, they were not calculated to please the king, no matter in what frame of mind he received them. Not but what the Yorkists still maintained that they were actuated solely by a desire to avert the ruin which threatened England. They said that it was because they understood that the Bishop of Terni, legate of the Apostolic See, had authority to try to bring about peace that they had called him to them, and they expressed, though in somewhat haughty tone, their readiness to be content if the injuries inflicted on the state and on themselves were redressed. They even announced their willingness to prove their devotion to the king and the state by making an effort, provided the king supplied them with a fleet and an army, to recover the rights and territories England had lost, or to do anything else the legate might consider honourable after he had weighed all the circumstances. But they also said quite frankly that they were prepared to fight if their demands were not granted, and granted speedily, and they declared that they put their hope in God, as their cause was just. Finally, after solemnly promising the legate that, saving the fidelity which they owed to their king, they would be faithful, devoted, and obedient to the Holy Father in all things lawful and honourable, especially as concerned the cause of the Faith, the succour of Christians against the Turks, and all other matters affecting the honour and estate of the Church and the Apostolic See, they asked him to go with them to England and to the king, whom they said they knew to be well-disposed towards him and whom they desired to assure of their good intentions.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, I., 23-24; Cal. Venetian Papers, I, 89.

The day the Yorkist earls drew up these defiant articles, Osbert Mountfort and two of his associates were beheaded by the sailors on the sands at the foot of the tower of Rysbank. This deed seemed a little out of keeping with the desire to avoid bloodshed which Coppini claimed for the Yorkists, but it did not deter the legate from accepting the earls' invitation to accompany them to England. The very next day, 26th June, March, Warwick, Salisbury, Fauconberg, Lord Audley, who by this time had been converted into a friend of his captors, Sir John Wenlock, and the legate took ship at Calais with some fifteen hundred men and, wind and weather being favourable, "arrived graciously at Sandwich."[2]

Upon landing the earls were welcomed by a great crowd of people, and, convinced that they could rely on the friendliness of Kent, they set out at once towards London.[3] Before nightfall they arrived at the church of St. Martin outside the walls of Canterbury. There they halted, not out of respect for the pious memories of Queen Bertha and St. Augustine, so closely bound up with that ancient church, though they were by no means indifferent to saints, but because they knew that there were three famous captains in Canterbury, Robert Horne, John Scott, and John Fogge, who had orders not to let them set foot in the city. As it proved, however, the three captains were either Yorkists at heart or thought resistance useless, for they came out at once to parley with the earls and soon reached an understanding with them. Canterbury's gates were then thrown open, and the Yorkists immediately hastened to the cathedral to kneel beside the tomb

[1] Ellis, Original Letters, Series III, Vol. I, p. 85.

[2] Worcester, 772; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 73; Davies' Eng. Chron., 94; Whethamstede, I, 371.

[3] According to Davies' Eng. Chron., Archbishop Bourchier met the Yorkists at Sandwich and, with his cross borne before him, marched with them to London. But as a matter of fact the archbishop was already in London.

of Thomas à Becket, an act of policy as well as of piety, since no one could hope to win or retain the affection of the citizens of Canterbury who failed to do honour to the city's world-famous shrine.[1]

Coppini, who was no lover of danger, had not come to Canterbury with his friends. But the next day, when the safety of the road had been tested, he arrived, took up his abode in the monastery of St. Augustine, and, after he had been refreshed by a night's sleep, visited the cathedral, where he was met at the door by the monks with crosses, incense, and holy water. It was already high time, however, to press on to London, and when the services at the cathedral in the legate's honour were over, the Yorkists marched out of Canterbury followed by a much larger force than had entered the city with them, as not only had Horne, Scott, and Fogge thrown in their lot with them, but many other men, including the Duke of York's old friend, Lord Cobham, had been flocking to their standard "like bees to the hive." Along the way from Canterbury to London still more friends presented themselves, so that by the time Blackheath was reached the earls had an army so large that William of Worcester understood that it was composed of twenty thousand men, while Coppini, who was fond of large figures, declared the number to be thirty thousand.[2]

While March, Warwick, and Salisbury were marching onward towards London with rapidly swelling ranks, there was great agitation in the capital. Some time before Lord Hungerford, Lord Scales, and Sir Edmund Hampden had arrived with a band of armed men to hold the city for the king, but when Scales proposed to assume the office of captain, the Londoners would have none of him and insisted that they were quite capable of withstanding the Yorkists "without any aid of lords."[3] Yet the city's magistrates thought it was wiser to keep up appearances in the presence of the king's troops, and the day after the Yorkists landed at Sandwich the common council agreed that everyone should support the mayor and the aldermen in an effort to resist the rebels. In accordance with this decision, guards were stationed at the gates, careful inquiry was made in each ward concerning strangers, and on the following day orders were given for the closing of the gate on the drawbridge and for the placing of men-at-arms in the tower above the bridge to lower the portcullis in case of need. After consultation with Hungerford, Scales, and Hampden, and with the express approval of the Archbishop of Canterbury, of Warwick's brother, the Bishop of Exeter, and of the Bishops of Norwich and Ely and the Prior of St. John's, all of whom were in London attending convocation, the common council also sent a deputation to the Yorkist earls to warn them that the citizens had been commanded to resist any attempt on their part to enter the city, and to try to dissuade them from coming to London at all.

---

[1] Chron. of John Stone, 79.

[2] *Ibid.*, 79-80; Worcester, 772; Whethamstede, I, 373; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 73; Hall, 243.

[3] Three Fif. Cent. Chron., *ut sup.;* Flenley's Six Town Chron., 150.

But it was hardly to be expected that Warwick, who had already passed through London once in safety, would be frightened away now. And perhaps few wanted him to be. At any rate, authority to treat with the Yorkists, as well as to warn them, seems to have been given to the city's deputies, and it was agreed to stand by any terms which the deputies might find themselves forced to accept. When, on Sunday, 29th June, the common council met again, it was decided that, in case the Earl of Warwick sent a messenger, the city should refuse to communicate with him; and not only were watches again set on the bridge and also at Billingsgate, but, apparently for fear of a surprise, all citizens capable of bearing arms were forbidden to attend the Sunday services at St. Paul's. Nevertheless, when, on this or the following day, Nicholas Bedford, the sergeant of the staple who had been permitted to go over to Calais in December and who, like Lord Audley, had succumbed to the wiles of the Yorkists as soon as he came into direct contact with them, arrived with a letter from March, Warwick and Salisbury asking if the Londoners would "stand with them in their just quarrel," the mayor and aldermen perused the letter and decided to receive the earls. So another deputation left London, this time to bid the Yorkists welcome, and Hungerford, Scales, and Hampden hurriedly shut themselves up in the Tower. To the Tower went also Lord de Vescy, Lord Lovel, Lord de la Warr, Jean de Foix, Earl of Kendal, the Duchess of Exeter, many "galley men," and other people.[1]

On 2nd July the Yorkists reached Southwark, and as soon as it was known they were approaching, the Bishops of Exeter and Ely went to meet them, with a number of men-at-arms, while a great throng of people, out of simple curiosity or because they wanted to show their good-will, also trooped out to Southwark. Such a hearty welcome must have delighted the Yorkists, and with as little delay as possible they hurried on to take possession of the place which seemed so eager for their presence. But their entrance into the city was marred by a painful accident. There were holes in the floor of London bridge, which had been badly damaged at the time of Cade's rebellion[1] and perhaps had never been properly repaired, and as the crowd was swarming back across it, thirteen of the men-at-arms attending the two bishops stumbled and fell. So heavy and cumbersome was the armour worn in those days that it was no easy matter for a man-at-arms to get up, when once he had fallen, and before the bishops' men could regain their feet, they were trampled to death by the crowd. Such a mishap as this might easily have been construed as an evil omen, but no one seems to have so interpreted it, and an act of compassion on the part of the Yorkists may have done something to offset it. London bridge bore its usual burden of ghastly decaying heads, and among the agonized faces looking down upon them the three earls may have recognized that of Roger Neville. At any rate, they knew well that more than one neck had been severed for the cause they represented, and they gave orders that every head on the bridge should be carefully removed and buried in the neighbouring church of St. Magnus.[2]

---

[1] London Journal 6, ff. 237-239b (Sharpe, London and the Kingdom, I, 299-301); Davies' Eng. Chron., 94-96; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 73; Worcester, 772; Stow, 408-409. "Galley men" were men who had come to England in the Italian galleys. On 25th August, 1460, a general pardon was granted to Nicholas de Pont, late of London, merchant, *alias* "galyman," and about

On entering the city, the Yorkists rode at once to St. Paul's, just as at Canterbury they had gone at once to the cathedral there. This time their object was to make thank offerings, and when they had accomplished this and had received the greetings of the mayor and aldermen and of the Archbishop of Canterbury and other prelates, they took up their quarters in the house of the Grey Friars, while their troops found camping ground in the field beyond Smithfield. The next morning, at nine o'clock, they presented themselves before convocation, and though the character of their welcome by that body was scarcely doubtful, seeing that they were supported

---

twenty other "galymen." Writs of Privy Seal, file 778; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 598. These may be the "Lombars" Waurin talks about. Waurin, II, 231-232.

[1] Gregory, 193.

[2] Worcester, 772-773; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., *ut sup.*

by the Bishops of Exeter and Ely, as well as by the Pope's legate, for the enlightenment of the citizens who crowded about St. Paul's to see and hear them they explained, as they had already done in their manifestoes, the reasons for their actions. They dwelt on the misgovernment of the kingdom; they declared that they had been driven from the king's presence by their enemies so that they might not be able to refute the false accusations made against them; and they announced that they had come back to England with a firm determination to assert their innocence before the king or die in the field. Then, on the sacred cross of St. Thomas of Canterbury, they solemnly swore, calling God, the Virgin, and all the Saints of Heaven to witness, that they intended nothing which was contrary to their allegiance to King Henry.[1]

The Yorkists spent two days in London, and they were busy ones, as numerous conferences were held at the Grey Friars' house, the army was got into marching order, and many persons were tried before the three earls at the Guildhall, with the result that a few men were beheaded in Cheapside and a number of others were sent to prison. At least one friendly deputation from outside the city also demanded a little time and attention. The town of Lydd hurried off some of her leading citizens to London "to speak with the lords for the town" and to find out what was expected of her, and the message sent back seems to have been that Lydd must keep a sharp lookout for Frenchmen. Rye too, now or a little later, sent a deputation "with excuse"—apparently for having given unwilling aid to the enemies of the Duke of York;[2] and doubtless other towns as well took pains to curry favour with the earls or to remind them of past favours. Yet, while all seemed to be going as well as the Yorkists could wish, the magistrates of London, though they had joined in the welcome to the earls, were feeling many misgivings down in the depths of their hearts because, when what they wanted above everything was peace, all signs pointed to war. When Brother John Davy of St. Katharine's by the Tower brought a request that those who had taken refuge in the Tower might be allowed to come into the city to get food, the common council, had the decision rested with it, would probably have given the desired permission. But the earls had no intention of helping their enemies to make themselves comfortable in the Tower, and the peace-loving council was so completely under their control that it soon found itself agreeing, the liberties of the city notwithstanding, to furnish carts, horses, etc. for the earls' army and to appropriate for the city's defence the "habiliments of war called the guns of the lord king" which were kept at Whitechapel. The council did venture to appoint certain doctors of theology to try to mediate between the Yorkists and their hungry countrymen in the Tower, but all to no avail. The earls had no time to listen to would-be peacemakers. And ultimately, at a meeting held on 4th July, the council went so far—for the sake of peace and of the prosperity of the king and the kingdom, as the minutes of the meeting record—as to grant towards the journey of the noble lords of March, Warwick, and Salisbury the sum of one thousand pounds, to be raised in the manner of a fifteenth. Haste should be made to say, however, that this grant was no free gift. The Bishops of Exeter and Ely, the Duke of York, and March, Warwick, and Salisbury were all expected to give bonds for the repayment of one half of the loan at Christmas and of the other half on the following St. John's Day.[1]

---

[1] Davies' Eng. Chron.; Worcester; Three Fif. Cent. Chron.; Flenley's Six Town Chron.; Fabyan, 636; Kingsford's London Chron., 171.

[2] Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 74, 169; Hist. MSS. Com., Report 5, app., 493, 522.

The members of London's common council were not the only persons who, while much preferring peaceful waters, found themselves swept along into the whirlpool of war. Coppini too had made the painful discovery that he was powerless to control the course of events, and while the common council was reluctantly voting a war loan to the Yorkists, he was making a desperate effort to set the world to rights with his pen. On 4th July the legate wrote two letters, one to King Henry and one to the Pope. The letter to Henry was read in full convocation, and also to the people at Paul's Cross, and while one copy of it was dispatched to the king by a messenger, another seems to have been sent to Margaret of Anjou through a dependent of the legate's, an Italian friar known as Lorenzo of Florence.[2]

What Coppini told the king, in addition to the circumstances which had led him to go to Calais, was that he still hoped for a peaceful adjustment of England's difficulties, and that it was because he entertained this hope, because delay was dangerous, and, lastly, because there was "no other way," that he had accompanied the Yorkist lords to England. That he had not already sought the king's presence was not his fault, he explained. The progress of the Yorkist lords had been even speedier than they had dared to hope, as the people had received them so eagerly; and for this reason, and also on account of the hindrances and dangers of the way, it had been impossible for him to hasten his journey. When he reached London, he said, he had been anxious to go on at once in order to fulfil his duties as a "faithful shepherd, nuncio, and mediator," but he had been prevented from doing so by many difficulties, chief of which was the wrangling and designs of some who claimed to be devoted to the king but were in reality enemies of peace. It was because he could not safely come in person that he was writing this letter, and he entreated Henry, for the love of God and out of pity for his people, to prevent the bloodshed which now seemed imminent. He assured the king that he could do this if he wanted to, admonished him that, if he did not do it, he would be guilty in the sight of God "in that awful day of judgment in which I also shall stand and require of your hand the English blood, if it be spilt," and urged him to arrange at once so that he could communicate with him and not to listen to anyone who told him he had just cause to fight; for everything could be arranged as justly and honourably without a battle as by a victory. The Yorkist lords, he declared, would tender their obedience if only they were given a chance to state their cause in safety, but this they believed to be impossible unless they came with a strong force at their backs. They would not use this force, however, if they were granted an audience; and the legate implored the king to consent to a conference with them. Such a conference would probably put an end to all the trouble, but if by any chance it failed, then the king would be justified in taking up arms, whereas to do so without making this effort for peace would be wicked and contrary to God's command. But whatever was done must be done quickly, the writer warned, if bloodshed was to be averted; and he entreated the king to trust him, declaring that those who resisted his efforts to restore peace were "clerks and ministers of the devil." "I expect a speedy reply," was his final warning, "because the danger is imminent and does not brook delay."[1]

---

[1] London Journal 6, ff. 252b-253; Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 24th July.

[2] Cal. Venetian Papers, I, 91, 93; Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 23, 38.

---

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 23-26; Cal. Venetian Papers, I, 89-91. Cf. Ellis, Original Letters, Series III, Vol. I, 88-97.

In his letter to Pius II Coppini enclosed a copy of what he called the conditions of peace drawn up by the Yorkists (probably meaning the articles of 25th June), and with his eloquent pen he drew for the papal benefit a brightly coloured picture of what had been occurring in England. "As we are all in a whirl to go to meet his royal Majesty," time did not permit him, he said, to relate at length the many things, "each worthy of a special messenger," which in a few days God Almighty had deigned to bring about through his instrumentality. But of a few he would write as best he could, while the horses were being got ready. First of all, he mentioned that since his last letter, written at Calais "with hasty speech and trembling hand" as he was about to take ship to cross to England with the lords of Calais, who had called him to treat of peace, he had journeyed with them to London, reaching there on 2nd July. On the way all the people, both men and women, had hastened to the assistance of the lords, so that, although the road to London is quite short and the land narrow on that side of the Thames, more than thirty thousand armed men were soon gathered about them. And when they drew near to London and the king's officials, who had been ordered to resist them, heard that March and the Earl of Warwick, "incredibly beloved by all," had arrived, they spurned all orders, threw wide the gates of the city, and let all the people go forth to welcome the earls with embraces and kisses. "These things I saw and was silent, most blessed Father, and although they were set before my eyes, yet they seemed wonderful and well-nigh impossible. And since fate and necessity had caused me to be as it were an angel of peace and a mediator, they looked upon me also with incredible applause, with reverence and tears, welcomed me, honoured me, praising the Lord and giving thanks with clasped hands to your Holiness because you had sent back and restored to them your legate, whose departure with his work undone they had lately mourned."

The welcome of the people of England was not the only triumph for himself that Coppini had to report to the Pope. In the midst of all the excitement he had been labouring anxiously, he told Pius, for the recognition of his legatine authority, and at last he had succeeded. In the full assembly of the Anglican synod, which had been summoned in vain to impose a subsidy for the king's aid, in the presence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, primate of all England, and other prelates and temporal lords, and amid the applause of the people, he had made a short extempore speech explaining his mission and the purpose of his Holiness, and thereupon his legatine authority had been reverently and unanimously accepted. "This too was openly proclaimed to the whole expectant crowd of perhaps one hundred thousand Christains. The whole city rejoices, most blessed Father, and my person, useless and unworthy though it be, is yet, for the merit of your Holiness, held in honour by all of both sexes. . . . . Meanwhile several persons, once rebels and unbelievers, now placed in the greatest predicament through danger from the armed and angry populace, by my word, alone, unarmed, have attained safety. O wonderous thing, good and merciful God! What confusion and sadness had lately overwhelmed me when those rebelled who were bound to obey your Holiness! What joy, what acclamation is now seen in all the people, since the aspect of affairs has been changed by the wonderful works of God!"

The legate was forced to confess that, although this was the happy state of affairs at present, something still remained to be done, as King Henry, who was at Northampton, was trying to raise an army. But the king was having difficulty in doing this, he declared, as the people, while they wanted to be faithful to their king, thought they were doing more for themselves and for the country by opposing him—a belief which was strengthened by the knowledge that the Yorkists had placed conditions of peace in his, Coppini's hands, as all were aware that he was devoted to the king and a friend of truth and peace. The people considered, he said, that the Yorkists had been brought back "as it were on my shoulders, or rather on those of the Church and your Holiness," and as they now looked for reform and peace, they were filled with incredible gratitude. "Today, therefore, we set out to his Royal Majesty, having sent before certain prelates with my letters, a copy of which I have enclosed." But the next sentence of the letter shows that "we" did not include the writer himself. For he added that he himself would follow more slowly until the king's answer was received and a safe means of communication was provided, "as the greatest danger threatens my safety on account of the snares of certain madmen, who are altogether incapable of truth and peace." If there was going to be a battle, he said, he did not want to see a spectacle so grievous. Yet he still hoped that such an outcome could be averted by the intervention of the English prelates and himself, and it also seemed probable that the king would want to avoid a battle, as it was reported the Yorkist army outnumbered his by four to one. "May Almighty God deign to put forth his hand and remedy these evils in accordance with my desire and labours," he concluded. "I will write the rest in order later, in a few days. But I hope for many good things, most blessed Father, for the glory of Your Holiness and the Church, as I have often written, if continued favour and authority are granted me by the same, and perchance such as were not known in the Church in the time of our forefathers. So may merciful God grant."[1]

Coppini evidently told the truth when he said that even as he was writing the horses were being saddled; for a part of the Yorkist army marched out of London the very day his letter was written, and the rest of it followed the next day. Only the Earl of Salisbury, Lord Cobham, and Sir John Wenlock remained behind, with enough men to hold the city and carry on operations against the Tower, which by this time was being attacked from land and water. As a report was going about that the king and his councillors had fled to the Isle of Ely, one body of Yorkists took the road leading to Ware, while the rest proceeded towards St. Albans. But none of them had gone far before it was learned that the king was still at Northampton.[2] Far from taking flight when he was told that Warwick had landed at Sandwich, Henry, leaving his wife and son at Coventry, had set out at once in the direction of London. As by the time he reached Northampton, however, he was informed that the capital of his kingdom had opened its gates to the earls, he decided to stay there and await the results of a hurried call for men which had been sent out with the enticing promise that, when the Yorkist earls were overthrown, everyone could "take what he might and make havoc" in Kent, Essex, Middlesex, Surrey, Sussex, Hampshire, and Wiltshire, the counties openly favouring the Duke of York.[3]

This promise of unrestricted plunder did not fail to bear fruit. The Earl of Northumberland and Lord Clifford, wardens of the east and west marches towards Scotland,[4] and Lords Neville, Roos, Egremont, and Dacre of Gillesland, all of whom were or had been in the north engaged in raising men, were able to send the king a fairly large army, and by Monday, 7th July, Henry's troops were encamped outside the walls of Northampton in Hardingstone Field, a meadow close to the nunnery of St. Mary de Pratis and to Sandyford mill and bridge.[1] But while everything was made ready for battle, there were evidently differences of opinion among the king's advisers, and Henry himself probably sympathized with those who thought the Yorkists ought to be given a fair hearing before war was resorted to; for on 7th July William Waynflete, Bishop of Winchester, a peace-loving man who had been chancellor of England for nearly four years, resigned the great seal and yet did not forfeit the gratitude or esteem of his sovereign.[2] Far better would it have been if Waynflete's advice had been taken to heart. Though the seal was placed in a chest which stood in the king's own tent, in a few days that chest and all its contents passed into the hands of the Yorkists, and when next the seal was brought forth, it was destined to be placed in the keeping of a chancellor of their choosing. Even at the moment that Waynflete was laying down the burdens of office, March and Warwick were nearing Northampton, and with an army, which if it did not number upwards of a hundred and sixty thousand men, as two chroniclers declare, or even twenty-five thousand men, as a more moderate estimate affirms, was at least larger than the king's.[3] Nor was this army composed solely of common soldiers. The two earls had with them a goodly number of lords temporal and even spiritual, including the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of London, Exeter, Lincoln, Salisbury,

---

[1] Vatican Transcripts, portfolio 62.

[2] Flenley's Six Town Chron., 150-151.

[3] Davies' Eng. Chron., 95, 98; Gregory, 209; Fabyan, 636.

[4] Bills of Privy Seal, file 1295; Writs of Privy Seal, file 678, 7th April; Rotuli Scotiæ, II, 399.

[1] Now St. Peter's bridge. Ramsay, who has printed an excellent map of the vicinity of Northampton, locates the battle of Northampton between Delapré Abbey and the town, close to the London road. But Waynflete's resignation of the great seal is recorded as having taken place in the king's tent "tunc situato in quodam campo vocato Hardyngstonefelde juxta abbatiam de pratis"; and this tallies with a statement in Three Fif. Cent. Chron. that the battle was fought between "Harsyngton and Sandyfforde," and also with John Stone of Canterbury's description of the battlefield: "And for the field's name, of that one part on the northeast side it is called Cowmeadow. And that other part is i-called Menthynfield. And for the other part is i-called of time Sandyngford bridge next the town. On the east side there is a water mill [that] is called Sandford mill."

[2] Privy Council Proceedings, VI, 361. That Waynflete did not incur Henry's ill-will by his resignation is proved by a letter which the king wrote to the Pope a few months later. See Chandler, Life of William Waynflete, 107-108, 346-348.

[3] Evidently it was reported before the battle that the Duke of York had arrived with a hundred thousand men. Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 153. So much has been said by Sir James Ramsay and others about the tendency of medieval chroniclers to exaggerate the size of armies that it seems needless to dwell on the subject further.

Ely, and Rochester, the Prior of St. John's, Viscount Bourchier, and Lords Fauconberg, Audley, Abergavenny, Say, and Scrope of Bolton. The Pope's legate also, though still avoiding the place of danger, was following not far behind the army, and report said, though he afterwards hotly denied the truth of the story, that he had proclaimed a remission of sins for all who fought for the Earl of Warwick and excommunication for all who aided Queen Margaret.[1]

As they approached Northampton, March and Warwick sent forward a delegation of bishops, headed by the Bishop of Salisbury and escorted by some men-at-arms, to ask the king to accept the mediation of the prelates who were with them and to suffer them to come into his presence to "declare themselves as they were." But the Bishop of Salisbury was an unfortunate person to choose for such a mission, as less than a year before he had been Henry's own emissary to the Yorkists at Ludlow, and he performed his task so badly[2] that the Duke of Buckingham, who was standing beside the king when the bishops were received and who himself had worked hard in days gone by to reconcile the rival factions endangering the safety of Henry's throne, spoke up angrily, saying: "Ye come not as bishops for to treat for peace, but as men of arms." "We come thus for surety of our persons," retorted the bishops, "for they that be-eth about the king be-eth not our friends." "Forsooth," replied the duke, "the Earl of Warwick shall not come to the king's presence, and if he come, he shall die." So the bishops could only return to those who had sent them and repeat Buckingham's words. Even after this Warwick sent a herald to say that, if he were given "hostages of safe going and coming," he would come "naked" to the king's presence; but when the herald also was refused a hearing, the earl dispatched a last messenger to the king to announce that "at two hours after noon he would speak with him or else die in the field."[3]

When matters reached this pass, some of the prelates accompanying March and Warwick began to feel very uncomfortable, and the Bishop of Hereford, who was Henry's confessor, and one other bishop left the earls and went over to the king. Nevertheless, March and Warwick prepared to fight. They divided their army into the customary three divisions or "battles," Warwick taking command of one division, March, who was bearing his father's banner, of another, and Fauconberg of the third, and, true to their word, at two o'clock in the afternoon of Thursday, 10th July, after giving orders that no man should lay hands on the king or the common people, "but only on the lords, knights, and squires," they commanded the trumpeters to give the signal for battle. Henry's army was well protected by a trench into which the waters of the river had been turned and which was also filled with stakes and brush, but unfortunately a heavy rain had begun to fall some time before the battle commenced, and when there was need to fire the guns, they lay so deep in water that they were utterly useless. Even this was not the worst, for when the Yorkists stormed the trench and succeeded in wading across it, Lord Grey of Ruthyn and some of his men ran forth from the king's army and helped them to clamber over the breastwork which had been thrown up behind the trench. In half an hour all was over and the Duke of Buckingham, the Earl of Shrewsbury, Viscount Beaumont, and Lord Egremont, brother of the Earl of Northumberland, were lying dead beside the king's tent, while three hundred more of the king's men, dead or dying, were scattered over the meadow and a still larger number were piled up in the river near the mill, where they had been drowned while trying to run away. The losses of the Yorkists were small, and although they succeeded in taking but few prisoners, among those few were their old enemy, Thomas Thorpe, and Pierre de Brezé's agent, Morice Doulcereau.[1]

---

[1] Cf. Gobellinus, 89, with Coppini's letter of 9th Jan., 1461, Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 38.

[2] Whethamstede, I, 372-373. Cf. some pages of a London chronicle printed in Eng. Hist. Review, Jan., 1913.

[3] Davies' Eng. Chron., 96-97. Cf. Waurin, II., 222-226.

As soon as the battle was over, March, Warwick, and Fauconberg went in search of the king, and when they found him in his tent, he was almost alone. There they knelt before him, begged him not to regret that God had seen fit to grant them the victory over their enemies, and assured him once more that their only wish was to promote his and the kingdom's welfare and to prove themselves his true liegemen. No choice being left to him, Henry listened and accepted, just as he had listened and accepted when York, Warwick, and Salisbury kneeled before him at St. Albans five years before. Then his new conquerors, accompanied by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, who had witnessed the battle from a neighbouring hill, took him to the abbey of St. Mary de Pratis, whence, a little later, he was conducted into Northampton in procession "with much royalty" and with crowds of people following after.[1]

---

[1] Davies' Eng. Chron., 95-97; Gregory, 207; Whethamstede, I, 372-374; Worcester, 773; Chron. of John Stone, 80; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 169; Nicolas's London Chron., 141; Flenley's Six Town Chron., 151; Hall, 244; Rolls of Parl., VI, 295; Commynes-Lenglet, II, 308; Waurin, II, 223. Waurin gives two accounts of the battle of Northampton, but while the first one agrees so well with what other chroniclers tell us that it may be accepted as reliable, the second one (II, 256-257) is totally untrustworthy. The account of the battle in the Chronique Scandaleuse, I, 5-9, is a curious and amusing perversion of the truth. Cf. Chartier, III, 122-123. Du Clercq says (liv. IV., c.x) that Warwick, in Henry's presence, cut off the heads of two or three of the king's chief ministers! Compare the report circulated in England that the Bishop of Hereford and Lord Egremont had been beheaded. Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 153.

The victors stayed in Northampton three days, and during that time they gave honourable burial to the Duke of Buckingham in the Grey Friars' Church and to the other victims of the battle in St. John's Hospital.[2] But on the morning of the fourth day, as soon as the sun had risen but not before they had received the Holy Sacrament, the earls set out with their royal captive for London. There, during their absence, Salisbury had been struggling hard to get possession of the Tower, but as yet entirely in vain. The departure of the bulk of the Yorkist army had given the men in the Tower new courage, and at once they had begun to shoot their guns and even to throw wildfire into the city, causing injury to a number of men, women, and children. The great bombards of the Yorkists—probably the "guns of the lord king" which the common council had appropriated—replied from the farther side of the river with such a will that the walls of the Tower were broken in several places, and Lord Cobham, aided by the sheriffs of London, attacked the fortress from the town side, and Sir John Wenlock and a mercer named Harow from St. Katharine's; but still the besieged held out. By this time the hesitancy of London's magistrates had completely vanished. On 6th July the common council added £260 17s. to the loan already made to the Yorkists, and on the 8th it voted that each alderman should donate five pounds towards the wages of some men who were ordered to assist Wenlock to prevent the carrying of food to the Tower. Moreover, when one day there came a letter from the Earl of Kendal, Lords Scales, Hungerford, and Lovel, and Sir Edmund Hampden in which they demanded to know why those who claimed to be true liegemen of the king made

[1] Davies' Eng. Chron., 97-98; Whethamstede, I, 374-375; Chron. of John Stone, *ut sup.*; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 74.

[2] Leland's Itinerary (Oxford, 1745), I, 10; Lewis, Topographical Dict.

war on them, who were also the king's true liegemen, the common council sent back word that it was the writers who had begun the trouble by "divers assaults, shooting of guns, and otherwise," and that as men, women, and children had been slain, maimed, and "mischiefed in sundry wise," the city was forced to defend itself.[1]

Nevertheless, Salisbury continued to have his hands full, not simply because his opponents were brave and stubborn, but because he had to keep "great watch for doubt of treason." On 9th July the common council decreed that each alderman should bring in ten pounds, that out of these contributions one hundred marks should be given to Sir John Wenlock to be distributed among the mariners and boatmen, who were on the point of mutiny, and that all the money left over should be used to pay the labourers employed on the fortifications, who also were probably showing signs of discontent.[2] But the boatmen and the labourers were not the only persons who required watching. On the 10th Sir Thomas Brown and one William Barton collected a band of men in the parishes of All Saints Barking, St. Dunstan in the East, and St. Botolph and contrived a way, in spite of the blockade, of getting into the Tower.[3] On the 11th the common council decided that, to prevent an insurrection, Wenlock must have one hundred pounds with which to pacify the mariners, and at the same time the wealthier citizens were appealed to for aid in raising a loan of five hundred marks for Salisbury's support, towards which the aldermen themselves pledged ten pounds apiece the next day.[4] It was at this anxious moment that word was received of the victory of Northampton, but the common council's joy must have been a little alloyed by the fact that the good news was accompanied by letters from March and Warwick asking for another loan of a thousand pounds. This loan the council granted on 14th July, on the same terms on which it had made the earlier loan of the same amount.[1] Two days later the victorious earls and their army re-entered the city.

---

[1] Davies' Eng. Chron., 95; Three Fif. Cent. Chron.; Whethamstede; London Journal 6, ff. 250b, 251b, 253b; Sharpe, London and the Kingdom, I, 301-302; III, 384.

[2] London Journal 6, f. 251b.

[3] See Miscellanea of the Exchequer 8/10 and Coram Rege Roll, no. 800, m. 9, from which it appears that Brown and Barton, with other traitors, rebels, and unknown enemies of the king, gathered in armed array in the parishes above named on 10th July and entered the Tower, which they continued to hold against the king's orders until 16th July.

[4] London Journal 6, f. 254a-254b.

For the second time Henry VI had returned to the capital of his kingdom as a prisoner. But, as before, an imposing escort attended him and all the forms of kingship were conscientiously kept up. The Earl of Warwick, bareheaded, carried the sword of state, the papal legate, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and many other prelates and temporal lords were in the king's train, and the citizens received their sovereign with honour and solemnity. And again, as after the battle of St. Albans, the Bishop of London loaned his palace for a royal residence. There Henry was installed once more, attended by the Yorkist lords and treated with every mark of respect, while Warwick himself seems to have found a temporary home at the Black Friars' house and March next door, in Baynard's Castle, his father's London house.[2] In the meantime London was giving "to Almighty God great laud and thanking," and an account of what had occurred at Northampton was speeding to the Duke of York in Ireland.[3]

The return of March and Warwick to London was soon followed by the capture of the Tower. On one occasion, to the grief of three merchants of Gascony, Lord Hungerford had succeeded in seizing a lighter which was carrying eighteen tons, a pipe, and a hogshead of wine and five barrels of sturgeon from a ship called the *Nicholas* of Spain to St. Katharine's wharf;[4] but aside from this and perhaps a few other lucky captures by the men in the Tower, Wenlock's blockade had been completely successful, and hunger and discouragement finally accomplished more than the "guns of the lord king". On the very day March and Warwick came back, the defenders of the Tower seem to have opened negotiations for surrender.[1] Brown and Barton and their band of men, who had entered the Tower at such risk and had experienced only a few days of short rations, were apparently opposed to yielding even now, and they continued to shoot wildfire into the city.[2] But to hold out longer was really impossible. Two days after he was brought back to London, King Henry rode through the city in regal state to attend mass at St. Paul's, and the same day his friends in the Tower came to terms with the Yorkists. Scales and Hungerford were able to secure a promise of freedom for themselves, but their associates, one and all, had to abide by the law. It was on this understanding that Wenlock and the mercer Harow took possession of the fortress on 19th July.[3]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, f. 255; Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 24th July. Early in August the common council loaned, or presented, £100 to the Earl of March. London Journal 6, f. 260.

[2] Hist. Croy. Cont., 549; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 74, 169; Whethamstede, I, 375; Fabyan, 636; Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 6th May—an order to pay one of the royal purveyors for beef and mutton supplied "after the field of Northampton at such time as we lay at Baynard's Castle and Henry late called king at Eltham." A year after he ascended the throne Edward ordered the payment of £200 to Archbishop Bourchier because by his desire and that of divers lords of Henry's council the archbishop had delivered to Henry "certain jewels in silver plate and cloth of gold to enorne with the chapel of the same late king" and had never recovered them. Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 26th February.

[3] Davies' Eng. Chron., 98; Fabyan, *ut sup.*

[4] Writs of Privy Seal, file 784, no. 267—a grant to the three merchants of a safeconduct for another ship.

Scales and Hungerford had been careful to make a good bargain for themselves, but, in spite of all, for one of them the day of doom was at hand. During the night Scales made an attempt to reach the sanctuary at Westminster, but as he was stealing out of the Tower, a woman recognized him and gave the alarm to the boatmen, who "gathered them together and followed him and fell upon him and killed him, and cast him on the land beside St. Mary Overy." The body of the murdered nobleman, "despoiled naked as a worm," lay unheeded for several hours near the church porch, where William of Worcester says he beheld it with his own eyes. The Earl of March, who was much grieved when he heard of his godfather's fate, and the Earl of Warwick, who also regretted Scales's death, caused the body to be taken into the church and given honourable burial,[4] but many people were probably clamouring for vengeance against the men who had turned the guns of the Tower on the city. For Warwick had to ride to the Tower and proclaim that justice would be administered to all the prisoners as speedily as the law would allow, without any favour or grace, and that by the advice of the lords of his council the king commanded that no one, on pain of death and forfeiture, should make any gathering or riot or commit any robbery, murder, or other crime, but that every man should repair to his own dwelling and "attend upon his lord or master such as he is in service with."[1]

---

[1] London Journal 6, f. 256; Sharpe, London and the Kingdom, III, 385.

[2] Miscellanea of the Exchequer and Coram Rege Roll, *ut sup.*

[3] Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 75; Worcester, 773; Davies' Eng. Chron., *ut sup.* Cf. Waurin, II, 230-232.

[4] Davies' Eng. Chron.; Worcester, 773-774; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 75, 153, 169; Gregory, 211; Hall, 245; Waurin, II, 233. Scales's monument in this church is mentioned in Stow's Survey of London, II, 58.

Two days after Warwick's proclamation at the Tower the prisoners were conducted by Lord Fitzwalter, who had now been made lieutenant of the Tower, to the Guildhall for trial before Warwick, Salisbury, William Hulyn, mayor of London, Sir Peter Ardern chief baron of the Exchequer, and others. All pleaded not guilty, and the number of convictions was probably smaller than the Londoners desired, as only Sir Thomas Brown and five other men, all of whom had been at one time or another in the service of the Duke of Exeter while he was constable of the Tower, were found guilty of treason by the jury. These six men were condemned to be drawn from Newgate jail, to which they had been removed after their arraignment, to the gallows at Tyburn, there to be hanged, drawn, beheaded, and quartered, and the sentence was carried out on 29th July.[2] Shortly after one John Archer, also a former servant of the Duke of Exeter, suffered death in a like manner. But there the executions seem to have ended, although Thomas Thorpe, who was caught while he was trying to get away in a monk's habit, was thrust first into Newgate jail and then, that still closer watch might be kept over him, into the Marshalsea.[3]

Of the chief men who had held the Tower against the Yorkists, Scales and Brown were now dead, but Lords Hungerford and Lovel, Sir Edmund Hampden, and Sir Gervase Clifton, who never wavered in their faithfulness to the Lancastrian cause, succeeded before long in joining Margaret of Anjou. On the other hand, the Earl of Kendal and Lord de la Warr were easily metamorphosed into Yorkists, and Lord de Vescy also sooner or later turned Yorkist. Before the end of August Kendal undertook to serve under Warwick at Calais, and so thoroughly was he liked and trusted by his former enemies that the officers of the Exchequer were directed to honour a promise King Henry had made to him only a short time before that he should have a hundred marks to help him to pay the ransom-bond which he had given in France after his capture at the battle of Castillon in 1453.[4]

---

[1] London Journal 6, f. 257; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 75.

[2] Miscellanea of the Exchequer and Coram Rege Roll, *ut sup.;* Rolls of Parl., VI, 19; Worcester, 773; Chron. of John Stone, 80; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 75, 169.

[3] Worcester and Three Fif. Cent. Chron., *ut sup.;* Rolls of Parl., VI, 295.

[4] Bills of Privy Seal, file 1295, 29th August; French Roll 38 Hen. VI, m. 3; Warrants for Issues, 39 Hen. VI, 4th Sept.; Marchegay, La rançon d'Olivier

As they were now masters of the situation, there was nothing to prevent the Yorkists from filling the important offices of state with their friends, and this they hurried to do. For a fortnight after the battle of Northampton the Archbishop of Canterbury presided over the Chancery, but on 25th July he surrendered the great seal to the king at the Bishop of London's palace. A quarter of an hour later it was given to George Neville, Bishop of Exeter.[1] Three days later Viscount Bourchier was made treasurer, while the privy seal was confided to the care of Robert Stillington, Dean of St. Martin's-le-Grand, a man whom Henry had once praised for his "great cunning, virtues, and priestly demeaning," and who now had the satisfaction of drawing up a warrant for the payment of his own wages as a member of the king's council. For although Stillington had been sworn in as a member of the council as long ago as 10th October, 1449, up to the present moment, apparently, he had never received a penny of the forty pounds a year to which he was entitled as one of the king's advisers.[2]

The Dean of St. Martin's was not the only member of the new council provided for King Henry who had sat in that body in other times. In fact, while Henry would miss some old friends as he looked about his council chamber—if he was invited into it in these days—he would discover only one face which had not already grown familiar to him in that place, and that was the youthful face of the Earl of March. For, in addition to March, those who sat about the council board were the Earls of Warwick and Salisbury, Archbishop Bourchier, the Bishops of Exeter, London, and Ely, the Dean of St. Martin's-le-Grand, the Prior of St. John's, Peter Taster, Dean of St. Severin's, Viscount Bourchier, William Bourchier, Lord Fitzwarine, Lord Fauconberg, Lord Dudley, Lord Stanley, Lord Stourton, Lord Beauchamp, Sir John Wenlock, and

---

de Coëtivy, École des Chartes, XXXVIII, 8. Kendal had not been in England long, as he was not released to raise the money for his ransom until 30th Jan., 1460.

[1] Privy Council Proceedings, VI, 362-363; Rymer, XI, 458. There is no record of the delivery of the seal to Archbishop Bourchier, and in the record of his surrender of it he is not described as chancellor of England.

[2] Writs of Privy Seal, file 778, 28th July—the warrant for the drawing up of Bourchier's letters patent; Devon, Issues of the Exchequer, 484; Letters of Margaret of Anjou, 130; Warrants for Issues, 39 Hen. VI, 30th Sept. Curiously enough, Stillington was not present at any of the meetings of Henry's council of which the records survive. Neither his appointment as keeper of the privy seal or Bourchier's as treasurer appears on the Patent Rolls.

John Say; and of all these men March was the only newcomer.[1] Even so forgiving a person as Henry VI must have felt some resentment when his eye fell on Lord Stanley, the man whose attainder he had refused to sanction in spite of the too good evidence of his unfaithfulness, and on Lord Dudley, who, when he last saw him, was marching away as his trusted lieutenant to fight the very Earl of Salisbury near whom he now sat. But proclamation had now been made in every county that the Duke of York and the Earls of March, Warwick, and Salisbury were the king's true subjects and friends,[2] and whomsoever those gentlemen saw fit to trust Henry had to tolerate.

On 30th July writs for a parliament were issued, but since plenty of time must be given for York to come over from Ireland, the date set for assembling was 7th October.[3] In the meantime the king was to be taken to Canterbury to render thanks at Thomas à Becket's tomb for the victory of his Yorkist friends. Henry was permitted to go to Greenwich on 28th July, and on 2nd August he arrived at Canterbury escorted by March, Warwick, Salisbury, the papal legate, and the Bishops of Exeter, London and Chichester. Archbishop Bourchier, who had gone down to Canterbury a little in advance, and the Prior of Christ Church welcomed the king, and on that day Henry was present at evensong in the cathedral. On the following day he took part in the procession. Three days later, when there was a procession to the shrine and through the nave of the cathedral, the cloisters, and the monk's burying-ground, the king again participated in the ceremonies; and on 14th August, when the Bishop of Chichester preached in the chapter-house and rewarded all of his listeners with a forty days' indulgence, Henry appeared at the first evensong, in the procession, at high mass, and again at the second evensong. Four days longer the strange thanksgiving pilgrimage lasted, and then, on the morning of the 18th, Henry meekly travelled back to Greenwich.[4]

One of the king's companions on the journey to Canterbury did not return with him. Council meetings had been held during the stay at Canterbury, and from the archiepiscopal city Warwick went on to Calais bearing an order from the council to take possession of Guines, which by another order Somerset was commanded to deliver up to him.[1] By this time Somerset was in a desperate frame of mind, and it seems that, when he first heard of the Yorkist victory at Northampton, he had applied to Charles VII for a safe-conduct so that he might flee into France. But though Charles, who would not have hesitated, as Philip of Burgundy had done, to accept Guines from the duke's hands, immediately sent the desired document, Somerset, who clung to the hope that the reports from England were exaggerated, did not make use of it at once. As late as 26th July the duke was still at Guines waiting for the return of a messenger who had been sent to seek fuller information about what had happened and about Queen Margaret's plans. Soon, however, the full truth became known. The Bishop of Bayeux and Pierre de Brezé, writing from Rouen on 26th July to Étienne Chevalier, treasurer of Charles VII, stated that as yet there was no certain news from England, since all that had been received so far had come by way of Calais and, as it was known that in Calais "ilz ne sont pas deux costés," news coming through that channel was not to be trusted. All that was sure, they said, was that King Henry had fallen into Warwick's hands, that Queen Margaret and her son had fled towards the Welsh border accompanied by the Duke of Exeter and a large number of men, and that Lord Scales was still holding the Tower of London for the queen.[2] But five days later Brezé wrote again, this time to tell of the arrival of an Englishman who had brought messages from King Henry on other occasions, and who now declared that the king had been betrayed by those in whom he had placed most confidence and in consequence had been captured by the Yorkists on the battlefield. The queen and the Prince of Wales, this man said, were safe.[3]

---

[1] Privy Council Proceedings, VI, 275, 297, 304-307; Cotton MS. Vespasian F. XIII, f. 32.

[2] Privy Council Proceedings, VI, 303; Rymer, XI, 460; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 647.

[3] Reports touching Dignity of a Peer, IV, 945-949.

[4] Chron. of John Stone, 80-81; Privy Seals. Stone does not mention that Coppini came to Canterbury with Henry, but the legate's letters prove that he was there on 6th and 15th August. Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 28-31.

When he was at last convinced that the bad news from England was true, Somerset made up his mind to leave Guines. So on 12th August, when he met and dined with the Count of Charolais at Ardres, he begged the count to get a safeconduct for him from Philip of Burgundy which would permit him to pass through the duke's domains on his way to France. But Philip, probably less out of friendship for the Yorkists than out of fear that, through

---

[1] Rymer, XI, 459.
[2] Waurin, II, 228, note.
[3] Beaucourt, VI, 291, note.

Somerset, Charles VII would get his hands on Guines, refused to grant the safeconduct; and, because of this refusal, Somerset was still at Guines when Warwick arrived at Calais.[1] Caught in a trap from which there seemed to be no way of escape, the duke consented to meet Warwick, and the interview took place at Newnham bridge, where Somerset had been so severely defeated in April. There the two rivals kissed and came to terms. Somerset, Andrew Trollope, and some members of the garrison of Guines were allowed to retire to Dieppe under safeconduct of the king of France, and Guines was handed over to Warwick's agent, Richard Whetehill, after Whetehill had paid the garrison nearly six hundred and fifty pounds.[2] Despite all this, however, the neighbouring castle of Hammes declined to yield to Warwick. Its isolated situation, its strong fortifications, and its deep moat made Hammes capable of holding out after both Calais and Guines had surrendered, and for more than a year it successfully defied every effort to take it. Moreover, even when Somerset had departed, Guines manifested a troublesome spirit, and ultimately Whetehill, on the advice of the king's council, turned out a part of the inhabitants of the town, as well as some of the soldiers of the garrison (9th January, 1461). After this purging, Guines sued to the king for a pardon and apparently got it,[3] but even that did not end the difficulties of Warwick's lieutenant; for the one hundred and thirty men Whetehill had retained in the castle clamoured for their wages and were so little placated by a promise that their claims should be paid within a year that, in the end, Whetehill had to hire thirty-three archers to help him to guard the place.[4]

Warwick had to leave the completion of the work at Guines and Hammes to Whetehill, because it was necessary that he himself should return to London as soon as possible. Though poor King Henry had been captured, one who was "more wittier than the king" was still at large, and what Margaret of Anjou might succeed in doing no man could foresee. The moment Somerset had surrendered Guines, therefore, Warwick, taking his mother with him, hastened back across the sea to help to circumvent Margaret in case she found assistance and attempted to rescue her husband.

---

[1] Chastellain, IV, 68, note 2, 484.

[2] Worcester, 774; Paston Letters, III, 234; Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 25th Feb.; Issue Roll, Mich. 1 Edw. IV, 25th Feb., 17th Mar.

[3] Signed Bills, file 1477, 16th Feb., 39 Hen. VI.

[4] Account Book of Richard Whetehill, Comptroller of Calais, 1 and 2 Edw. IV, Exchequer Accounts, France, bundle 196, no. 2. Cf. the warrant of 25th Feb. cited above.

Margaret had waited at Coventry when Henry set out on the fatal journey which ended in the battle of Northampton, and as soon as the appalling news of his defeat and capture reached her, she had fled with her little son towards Wales. But she was not accompanied by a large number of men, as the Bishop of Bayeux and Brezé stated in their letter to Charles VII's treasurer. Only the Duke of Exeter and about half a dozen other persons were with her. Had it been otherwise, she would probably have escaped one of the picturesque adventures of her strange life. While she was passing near Malpas, in some unexplained way she fell into the hands of one John Cleger, one of Lord Stanley's men, and either by Cleger or, as one version of the story has it, by a former servant of her own whom she had made " both yeoman and gentleman and after appointed for to be in office with her son," was robbed of all the jewels and other valuables she had with her.[1] However, no worse harm than this befell her, and in time she reached Harlech Castle and was warmly welcomed there. Yet, for some reason, she did not feel quite safe even at Harlech, so in a little while she went to Denbigh, where the presence of the Earl of Pembroke seemed to promise surer protection. On Pembroke's fidelity she could rely with certainty, although her enemies, having found out in what direction she had fled, were already doing all they could to render Wales an inhospitable retreat for her. At one of the council meetings held during the pilgrimage to Canterbury, the Yorkists had sent orders to the Earl of Pembroke to hand over Denbigh to the deputies of the Duke of York, to Lord Powis to surrender Montgomery Castle to Walter Devereux, and to the constables of Beaumaris, Conway, Flint, Hawarden, and Ruthin to guard those castles well and deliver them to no one except by the king's order. Shortly after Sir William Herbert, Devereux, and Roger Vaughan were empowered to take all possible measures in all possible haste against certain persons who had made great assemblies of people and fortified certain castles in Wales, and Thomas Vaughan, who had been appointed master of the king's ordnance in succession to the murdered John Judde, was directed to collect and repair all ordnance belonging to the king and to provide transportation for it by land and water.[1]

---

[1] Worcester, 773; Gregory, 208-209; Davies' Eng. Chron., 98-99. Gregory seems to confuse this adventure of the queen with her later and more famous one, which occurred in 1463. See later.

But for the moment at least Margaret was safe, not only because her husband had many faithful friends in Wales who would take no orders from her enemies, but because the Yorkists had another foe to think about. The orders to Thomas Vaughan were probably given less with a view to the need of pursuing the queen, than in anticipation of war in the north. For almost at the moment that the lords of Calais arrived at Sandwich, they had learned that the king of Scotland had invaded his neighbour's precincts and laid siege to Roxburgh Castle. The story James II wrote to the Duke of Milan was that the Duke of York had appealed to him for aid, and that, to help the duke to assert his right to the English throne, he renounced his truce with King Henry and attacked Roxburgh. It was even rumoured that James had promised that his daughter should marry York's son.[2] But even if these unlikely stories had some truth in them, an attack on Roxburgh, which, if successful, would too probably be followed by an attack on Berwick also, was by no means the sort of help the Yorkists were craving. Should those castles be captured by the Scots, the English people would hold them responsible for the catastrophe and hurl at them the same taunts that had been hurled at their enemies on account of the loss of England's possessions in France. Consequently, when the news of what was going on at Roxburgh was brought to the earls at Canterbury, they immediately decided that Salisbury must raise an army and hasten to the castle's rescue.[3] In the meantime, though the fact was still unknown in southern England, a tragic event had occurred at Roxburgh. On Sunday, 3rd August, James II, who was "very expert in the shooting of great artillery" and "took great pleasure thereintill," allowed his curiosity to draw him too near his guns, and the bursting of a huge Flemish cannon suddenly terminated his sojourn on this planet. Notwithstanding their king's death, the Scots went on with the siege of Roxburgh, and five days later the castle surrendered On the following Sunday James III, a child of nine years, was crowned in the neighbouring abbey of Kelso, and then, Roxburgh having been dismantled, the Scots moved on to attack Wark Castle, which in its turn was taken and razed.[1] But alarming as all this was, the Scots now showed a wish to treat, and as the Yorkists were glad to respond, on 26th August the chancellor of England issued a safeconduct for an embassy from Scotland.[2] Thus all danger of further aggressions by the Scots seemed to be removed, and Salisbury, relieved from the necessity of carrying on a campaign in the north, was able to stay in London and share in the welcome to the Duke of York, whose arrival from Ireland to complete the work already so well begun by his son and his friends was now expected at any hour.

---

[1] Privy Council Proceedings, VI, 302-305; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 599, 612. Before the end of August Vaughan was also made keeper of the Great Wardrobe. He held the office just 169 days. Writs of Privy Seal, file 778, 29th August; Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 7th Dec.; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 646.

[2] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 23, 27.

[3] Rymer, XI, 461; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 589, 612.

---

[1] Auchinleck Chron., 20-21; Lesley, 31-32; Major, Hist. of Greater Britain, Bk. VI, c. xviii-xix; Buchanan, Hist. of Scotland, Bk. XII, c. i.

[2] Cal. of Documents relating to Scotland, IV, 266.

CHAPTER IV

YORK'S FAILURE

THE moment he heard of the victory at Northampton, York had commenced to make preparations to leave Ireland. It must have taken several days for the good news to travel to Ireland, and yet within ten days after the battle the duke sent Lord Clinton across the Irish Sea to arrest ships in the Severn to form a fleet for his home-coming. One Martin Serres, a merchant of Guienne, who had a ship laden with cloth at Ilfracombe, was obliged to hand it over to Clinton for the duke's service, although all that he was offered in return was a promise that he should have his ship back again when the duke was through with it. At Bristol a merchant of Bordeaux named Stephen Lane also saw his ship, the *Marie* of Layborne, with its cargo of broadcloths and much other merchandise, appropriated by Clinton and carried off to Ireland, and two other *Maries*, the *Marie* of Bayonne and the *Marie* of Rochelle, were seized in the same port.[1]

Notwithstanding Clinton's success in finding ships, it was not until about 8th September that York landed near Chester, at a place called Redbank or Redcliff. Even then he brought with him only the Earl of Rutland, Clinton, and a handful of men clad in a livery of white and blue embroidered with fetterlocks, one of the badges of the duchy of York.[2] Nor did the duke seem to be in a hurry to go to London now that he was in England. After tarrying several days at Chester,[3] he went to Ludlow, and from Ludlow to Hereford, whither his duchess came to meet him. One of John Paston's correspondents wrote from London that on 15th September he had been asked to allow the Duchess of York, her two sons, "my Lord George and my Lord Richard, and my Lady Margaret, her daughter," to lie in his master's house "until the coming of my Lord of York," and that he had granted them permission to stay there until Michælmas, but that within two days the duchess received word that her husband had landed at Chester, and on the following Tuesday he sent for her to meet him at Hereford. At the summons of her lord, the duchess hurried away "in a chair covered with blue velvet, and four pair coursers therein."[1]

---

[1] Signed Bills, file 1490, no. 3786, 18th March, 1462; Writs of Privy Seal, file 818, no. 2418, 23rd April, 1468; Inquisitions, Miscellaneous, Chancery, file 317.

[2] Worcester, 774; Gregory, 208; Whethamstede, I, 376. Concerning the fetter-lock badge, see Archæologia, XVI, 226. Murrey, or deep crimson, and blue were the livery colours of the house of York. *Ibid.*, XXXIX, 368, note.

[3] He was still at Chester on 13th September, as a grant which he made on that day of the constableship of Denbigh Castle to Robert Bold is dated there. Chancery Diplomatic Documents (Domestic), no. 943.

Even from Hereford York did not go directly to London. "My Lord of York hath divers strange commissions from the king for to sit in divers towns coming homeward," was some of the further news Paston's correspondent gave him; "that is to say, in Ludlow, Shrewsbury, Hereford, Leicester, Coventry, and in other divers towns, to punish them by the faults to the king's laws." Evidently the duke was glad to be detained along the way because it was with parliament that he meant to have his dealings, and parliament had not yet assembled. But during his delay much speculation concerning his intentions was going on. Some persons still believed that all that he wanted to do was to give England peace and better government. Had he not always proclaimed this to be his purpose, and his only purpose? But older and wiser heads suspected that, however honest the duke may have been at first in his protestations of loyalty to the house of Lancaster, he had since come to cherish ambitions of a very dangerous character, that he meant, in fact, now that the fortunes of war had again put King Henry at his mercy, to press his hereditary title to the crown.[2] And the duke's conduct, when at last he drew near to London, certainly seemed to justify this suspicion; for, on reaching Abingdon, he sent for trumpeters and clariners, gave them "banners with the whole arms of England without any diversity," ordered his sword borne upright before him, and in this manner rode on towards the city.[3]

---

[1] Paston Letters, III, 233-234; Gregory, *ut sup.*

[2] Whethamstede, I, 376.

[3] Gregory. It was surmised in Burgundy, or at least at Bruges, when news of the victory of the Yorkists at Northampton reached there, that Warwick would depose Henry and make the Earl of March king at once, setting aside Henry's son, "as they are beginning already to say that he is not the king's son." Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 27. But there is nothing to show that Warwick really thought of Edward as the proper person to wear the crown until after York's death, and certainly all of York's actions indicate his intention to claim the throne for himself.

When the day set for the opening of parliament, 7th October, came, the king, who had been staying at Eltham and Greenwich of late "to hunt and to sport him there," returned to the city for the ceremony, and this time he was suffered to live at Westminster Palace.[1] With the exception of the Earl of Wiltshire, who was presumably still in "Dutchland," and Lord Rivers, who was probably forcibly detained at Calais, all the Lancastrian lords as well as all the Yorkist lords had been duly summoned to the parliament. Notwithstanding this, when the session began, most if not all of York's leading opponents were absent from the House of Lords, as Buckingham, Shrewsbury, Viscount Beaumont, Lords Egremont and Scales were dead, while the Dukes of Exeter and Somerset, the Earls of Northumberland and Devonshire, and many of the northern lords never thought of answering the summons to Westminster.[2] And even if the means so successfully used to pack the House of Commons with Lancastrians at the time of the Coventry parliament had not been resorted to on this occasion to pack it with Yorkists, there were probably as few Lancastrian sympathizers in the lower House as in the upper. One member of the Commons was John Paston, and a letter which he received from his friend Friar Brackley after he had gone up to Westminster shows how general was the feeling that a fateful hour had struck. "God save our good lords, Warwick, all his brethren, Salisbury, &c.," wrote the friar, "from all false covetise and favour of extortion, as they will flee utter shame and confusion. God save them and preserve from treason and poison; let them beware thereof for the pity of God; for if aught come to my Lord Warwick but good, farewell ye, farewell I, and all our friends! for by the way of my soul, this land were utterly undone, as God forbid."[3]

It was on 10th October that York finally reached London. At his back he had five hundred armed men and a large body of retainers hurriedly gathered up since he landed in England, and, after pausing in the city just long enough to be formally received by the mayor and aldermen, he rode straight to Westminster with his trumpets and clarions giving loud notice of his arrival and with his sword still borne upright before him.[4] Passing through

---

[1] Paston Letters, *ut sup.;* Privy Seals.

[2] Worcester, 774.

[3] Paston Letters, III, 226-227.

[4] London Journal 6, f. 271; Worcester, *ut sup.;* Whethamstede, I, 377; Kingsford's London Chron., 171; Fabyan, 637; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 75, 170; Nicolas's London Chron., 141.

Westminster Hall, he presented himself before the House of Lords and, striding up to the empty throne, laid his hand on the cushion for an instant, as if he were about to take possession of his rightful seat. But the shout of welcome and approval which he evidently expected to hear failed to greet his ears, and in angry surprise he withdrew his hand and, turning his face towards the assembled lords, stood silent under the canopy of state while he studied the faces before him and still waited for the expected welcome. It was a tense and awkward moment, and at length the Archbishop of Canterbury, feeling that someone must break the silence, stepped forward and, saluting the duke, inquired if he wished to go to see the king. But to recognise the king's existence in any way was the last thing York desired to do, and he replied haughtily and with obvious irritation: "I know of no one in the realm who would not more fitly come to me than I to him." Then the agitated archbishop hurried away to report these strange and significant words to the king, and the duke descended from the dais and stalked out of the room.[1]

Such a reception as this from the House of Lords ought to have taught York the need of proceeding with more caution. But caution was contrary to the nature of Richard Plantagenet. On leaving the House of Lords, the duke took no counsel with his friends, who might have soothed his anger and curbed his impatience, but made his way forthwith to the king's chamber, where, finding that the bars had been drawn for fear of what he might seek to do, he broke the doors open and forced Henry to remove to the rooms formerly occupied by Margaret of Anjou. On such actions as these only one interpretation could be put, and it is not surprising that there arose "a noise through the city that King Henry should be deposed and the Duke of York should be king."[2]

But York had overreached himself, and if the story told by Jean de Waurin is to be believed, no one was more astounded or more dismayed by the duke's conduct than the three earls who had prepared the way for his coming, and who had a much better understanding than he had of the temper of the people at the moment. In spite of all the misery and humiliation which England had suffered during Henry's reign, the English people as a whole still loved and revered their gentle, pious king. The Yorkists themselves had repeatedly testified to Henry's blamelessness, and even those who had urged them to return to England had stipulated that no wrong was to be done to the king. Better government was sorely needed, no one could deny, but it was the proud, self-willed Margaret of Anjou and her rapacious and unscrupulous ministers, not the frail, dull-witted, kindly Henry whom the people held responsible for their wrongs; and the return of March, Warwick, and Salisbury from Calais had been hailed with joy for the reason that Englishmen longed to rid themselves, not of Henry of Lancaster, but of the Earl of Wiltshire and his colleagues. All this Warwick realized, and, according to Waurin, not only did he argue long and sharply with York, but March too endeavoured in vain to turn his father from his purpose.[1]

---

[1] Whethamstede, I, 376-377.

[2] *Ibid.*; Hist. Croy. Cont., 550; Davies' Eng. Chron., 99; Fabyan, *ut sup.*

That York should feel disappointed and chagrined by the welcome he had received was but natural. He had come home believing that his claim to the throne would be so promptly recognized that he could be crowned on All Saints' Day; and even when the House of Lords shrank back in astonishment on discovering his intention and the people of every degree, age, and sex began to murmur against him,[2] he could not give up this hope. After a few days, during which, at the instance of the Commons, the parliament held at Coventry in the preceding year was declared by its successor to be "void and taken for no parliament" and all its acts were annulled,[3] the duke presented himself before the Lords again, apparently in the belief that, since the Commons had taken this action, all that Henry's subjects had really needed was a little time in which to recover from their surprise. For this time the duke went so far as to sit down on the throne, and, addressing the Lords, declared that the crown of England was his by right of inheritance. Again, however, the response was not what he looked and hoped for, as the Lords, far from applauding what he said, were plainly dismayed.[4]

Even after he had received this second rebuff, York could not bring himself to believe the unpalatable truth. On 16th October he sent to the Lords, with a request for a speedy reply, a written exposition of his lineage, which he traced back through Lionel,

---

[1] Waurin, II, 244-249. Waurin's story is so interesting that one would like to believe it.

[2] Davies' Eng. Chron., 100; Whethamstede, I, 377-380.

[3] Rolls of Parl., V, 374.

[4] Fabyan. Cf. Worcester and Hist. Croy. Cont.

Duke of Clarence, third son of Edward III and older brother of Henry VI's great-grandfather, John of Gaunt, and through Edmund Langley, Duke of York, fifth son of Edward III, to King Henry III and Edward, "his first begotten son," and on which he based the assertion that Henry IV had "unrightwisely" seized the throne. But the Lords, some of whom, anticipating what was going to happen, had taken care to be absent that day,[1] merely listened to this challenge without taking any action, and when, the next day, the chancellor told them that the duke was pressing for an answer, they tried to wriggle out of their dilemma by saying that the subject was one with which they ought not to tamper without the king's order. However, it was evident that the duke did not intend to let his claim be ignored, and the Lords finally agreed to consult the king and find out what he wished to have done. So to the king they went accordingly. But all that Henry dared to do was to throw the responsibility back on the Lords. He told them to go and hunt up all the objections to the duke's claim that they could find, while they entreated him to search his memory for such objections, "in so much as his said Highness had seen and understanden many divers writings and chronicles."

Having failed in their attempt to shift the burden of a decision on to the king's shoulders, on the following day the Lords sent for the justices and, laying the duke's paper before them, commanded them in the king's name to find arguments against his claim. But the justices were just as loth as the Lords to take so heavy a responsibility upon themselves. With some hemming and hawing, they replied that they could not properly interfere in a matter between the king and the Duke of York, and that this particular matter, as it "touched the king's estate and regalie, which is above the law and past their learning," could only be determined by the lords of the king's blood.[2]

---

[1] Worcester.

[2] Mr. Plummer (Fortescue's Governance of Eng., 54) thinks that Sir John Fortescue's short tract entitled "The replicacion made agenste the title and clayme by the Duc of Yorke to the Crownes and Reaumes of England and Fraunce" was written by the Chief Justice to set forth the reply he would have made if he had been suffered to express his opinion on this occasion. Fortescue's points are: (1) if the crown could descend through a woman, which in his opinion it could not do, then it belonged by right neither to Henry nor to York but to the king of Scotland, who was descended from St. Margaret, the sister of Eadgar the Aetheling; (2) Philippa, from whom York was descended, was not really the daughter of Lionel, Duke of Clarence, but a child begotten in adultery; (3) Edward III entailed the crown upon

When it became evident that the justices would do nothing, the Lords turned to the king's sergeants and attorney. But the sergeants and attorney, shielding themselves behind the justices, replied that, since the matter was "so high that it passed the learning of the justices, it must needs exceed their learning," and begged to be excused from giving any advice. When the chancellor retorted that they could not be excused, as they were the king's special counsellors "and therefore they had their fees and wages," they answered that they were the king's counsellors in the law "in such things as were under his authority or by commission, but this matter was above his authority, wherein they might not meddle."

By this time one person at least had made up his mind that the Lords, however great their reluctance, would have to act. The chancellor finally reminded the Lords that they were the ones whom the king had commanded to defend his title and to defeat York's claim, and asked them to say what they could on the king's behalf. Then it was agreed that each lord should have the right to say what he thought without risk of unpleasant consequences, and the result was that five objections to the duke's claim were recorded: (1) the oaths which the lords of the land had taken to King Henry; (2) the acts of parliament, "of much more authority than any chronicles," by which the title of the house of Lancaster to the throne had been strengthened; (3) "divers entails" of the crown upon the heirs male, "as it may appear by divers chronicles and parliaments"; (4) the duke's custom of bearing the arms of Edmund Langley instead of those of Lionel of Clarence; (5) the assertion of Henry IV that he took the crown, not as a conqueror, but as "right inheritor" to Henry III.

To these five objections York offered a written reply, and his answer to the first one is a sample of medieval casuistry that would have done credit to a pope. "Every man," declared the duke, "under pain of everlasting damnation, is bounden to obey the law and commandments of God, by the which law and commandments truth and justice owe to be preferred and observed and untruth and injustice laid apart and repressed; and so it is that of this bounden duty[1] of obedience to God's law no man may discharge himself by his own deed or act, promise or oath, for else of the contrary would ensue innumerable inconveniences. Wherefore,

---

his heirs male, and his daughters renounced before parliament any claim they might otherwise have had to the crowns of England and France.

[1] The actual reading is "bond and duty," an obvious misprint.

sith it is so that the matter of the title and claim of the said Richard Plantagenet is openly true and lawful and grounded upon evident truth and justice, it followeth that man should have rather consideration to truth, right, and justice in this matter according with the will of the law of God than to any promise or oath made by him into the contrary; considered, namely, that by the law of Holy Church an oath made by one person unto the prejudice or hurt of another, contrary to truth, justice, and charity, in which standeth the plentitude and perfection of God's law, is void and of none effect, neither in any wise obligatory, and that the virtue and nature of an oath is to confirm truth and of no wise to impugn it; and, over that, that by the oath of fealty, homage, or liegeance no man is bounden to any inconvenient or unlawful thing."[1]

After dealing with the first objection in this manner, the duke expressed his willingness to refer the question to any competent spiritual judge—"forasmuch as the matter of oaths is a matter spiritual"—and then passed on to the second and third objections. These he tried to dispose of by denying that there were any such acts or entails made by parliament, with the exception of an act of the sixth year of the reign of Henry IV which entailed the crowns of England and France upon that king and his heirs, his four sons and their heirs. He added, too, not without some reason, that if Henry IV could have obtained the crown by title of inheritance, he would neither have needed nor desired to have it granted to him by act of parliament. In answer to the fourth objection the duke asserted that he might lawfully have borne not only the arms of Lionel of Clarence, but also those of England and France as borne by Edward III himself, but that he had abstained from doing so, as he had abstained for a time from pressing his title to the throne, for reasons known to all the realm. And finally, to the fifth objection he replied that what Henry IV said when he assumed the crown was false and intended merely "to shadow and colour fraudulently his said unrightwise and violent usurpation."[2]

From the time he sent in his statement of his claim, York wisely kept away from the parliament chamber. But his conduct in another respect was less discreet. Although he was living under the same roof with Henry, he repelled every effort which was made to induce him to visit the king with the declaration that he held of no man, but only of God. The Londoners, always longing for a pageant, had hoped that Henry would wear his crown on St. Edward's Day (13th October), but on that day and every day there was too much anxious discussion going on to leave time for state processions.[1] However, all controversies have to be settled sometime, and at last, on 25th October, when York's pretensions had been under debate for more than a week, the chancellor announced in the House of Lords that, in as much as it was thought by all the Lords that the duke's title was undeniable, a compromise had been suggested which would save the king's honour and yet at the same time appease the duke, "if he would;" and this compromise was that Henry should retain the crown and the royal dignity as long as he lived, but that after his death the duke and his heirs should succeed to the throne. After making this statement, the chancellor invited the Lords to suggest a better arrangement if any of them could think of one, but as it was patent that the one proposed represented the very best bargain that could be made with York, in the end all gave their consent to it. Yet the Lords felt anything but comfortable about the step they were taking, and to satisfy their scruples the following clause was added: "the oaths that the said Lords had made unto the king's Highness at Coventry and other places saved, and their consciences therein cleared."

---

[1] One of York's friends (Whethamstede, I, 383-384) would have us believe that the Pope had absolved him from his oath of allegiance to Henry.

[2] Rolls of Parl., V, 375-377.

To the Lords, who had thus been compelled, so much against their will, to make the momentous decision, fell also the disagreeable duty of announcing that decision to the king; and at that point even the chancellor's courage threatened to fail. As the Lords were passing out of the parliament chamber on their way to the king, the chancellor stopped them and asked them anxiously whether, since it devolved on him to lay the matter before his Majesty, they would stand by him however his Majesty took it. They promised him that they would. The recorded account of the audience with Henry is as brief as it is pathetic. "All these premises thus showed and opened to the king's Highness, he, inspired with the grace of the Holy Ghost, and in eschewing of effusion of Christian blood, by good and sad deliberation and advice had with all his lords spiritual and temporal, condescended to accord to be made between him and the said duke and to be authorized by the authority of this present parliament."

---

[1] Davies' Eng. Chron., 100; Kingsford's London Chron., 171; Fabyan, 637.

According to the settlement thus sanctioned and accepted by the helpless king, York's title to the crown was acknowledged, but he consented, on the understanding that his title would not be in any way prejudiced thereby, that Henry, because he had been in possession of the crown all his life, should continue to be recognized as king to the end of his days. The duke also promised that he himself would honour Henry as his sovereign lord. And as a guarantee of good faith, he and his sons, March and Rutland, were to take an oath that they would never do or consent to anything which might lead to "the abridgment of the natural life of King Henry the Sixth, or to the hurt or aminishing of his reign or dignity royal," but, on the contrary, would oppose any act tending to such an end with all their might and power. In return for this York was to be recognized as the heir to the throne and to succeed Henry immediately after his death, "or when he will lay from him" his crown and dignities; and conspiracy against the duke's life was to be ranked as an act of high treason. Parliament was also to allot to York estates of the value of ten thousand marks a year, and the Lords were to take an oath to accept the duke and his heirs as heirs to the throne and to keep the agreement with the duke in all particulars, while the duke and his sons were to swear that they would defend the Lords against anyone who might take exceptions to the agreement.

When the Commons were called upon to endorse what the Lords had done, they did so without a protest; and it was with the consent of the Commons as well as of the Lords that the king accepted and confirmed York's title to the throne and that all the acts and ordinances of parliament by virtue of which Henry IV and his heirs, or Henry V and his heirs, had become "inheritable" to the crown were declared to be null and void. On the last day of October York and his two sons came into the parliament chamber and gave the promises and took the oaths that were required of them.[1] At the same time Henry promised to keep the agreement which had been made with the duke. Then, in the evening, in company with York and many other lords, he heard evensong at St. Paul's and afterwards, in order that York might have complete possession of Westminster Palace, was taken—against his will, we are told—to his old quarters in the Bishop of London's palace.[2]

---

[1] Rolls of Parl., V, 377-380.

[2] Fabyan, 637; Kingsford's London Chron., 172; Gregory, 208.

Though York had not been able to take the crown at once, as he had hoped to do, the substance of power was now his, the shadow of it alone was Henry's. This was a victory with which the duke would have been very well content a few years before, but not so now. His disappointment was deep and bitter, and he was as incapable of hiding his feelings as a child which sees some glittering bauble snatched back just as he puts out his hand to grasp it. The night of Henry's removal to the episcopal palace the duke rode to the palace by torchlight and "took upon him as king and said in many places that this is ours by very right"; and it must have been galling indeed to his pride that when, on the following day, the desire of the populace for a procession was at last gratified, it was Henry instead of himself who wore the crown.[1] But on 9th November he was proclaimed heir apparent to the throne,[2] and about the same time the king, by the advice of the Lords and Commons, directed "his dearest cousin, Richard, very and rightful heir of the realms of England and France and of the lordship and land of Ireland, Duke of York," to take upon himself the task of suppressing the rebellions and other disorders which had broken out in England and Wales, and to resist the French and the Scots, in case they invaded the kingdom. Every man was ordered to attend upon and obey the duke as the case might require, although this was to be in no way prejudicial to the king's prerogative and power royal. And to the king was also carefully reserved his right of pardon.[3]

York did not forget to reward his friends now that he was practically in control of the government. Salisbury, who had rendered such yeoman service in London and elsewhere, was made great chamberlain of England on 29th October; John Dynham, the brave captor of Lord Rivers and Osbert Mountfort, received the office of chancellor of Ireland on 5th November; Sir John Wenlock was made chief butler on 14th November,[4] and a little earlier Walter

---

[1] Gregory, Fabyan, and Kingsford's London Chron., *ut sup.* Cf. Waurin, II, 250, who says that in the procession Warwick bore the sword before the king and March carried the mantle of the king's train.

[2] Fabyan and Kingsford's London Chron.

[3] Rolls of Parl., V, 382-383.

[4] Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 627, 640, 644; Writs of Privy Seal, file 779, 28th Oct. The warrant for Wenlock's appointment had been sent to the chancellor as early as 27th August. *Ibid.*, file 778, 27th August. Dynham was confirmed in the office of chancellor of Ireland by Edward IV on 2nd May, 1461. Rotulorum Patentium et Clausorum Cancellariæ Hiberniæ Calendarium, I, 268.

Blount, nephew of the John Blount who had accompanied Warwick from Calais to Ludlow in the preceding year, had stepped into the place of Sir Gervase Clifton as treasurer of Calais.[1] The office of constable of Dover Castle and warden of the Cinque Ports, left vacant by the death of the Duke of Buckingham, was the reward given to Warwick, who, as captain of Calais, already had command of the opposite shore of the narrow strait through which all the maritime commerce of Europe moving north and south had to pass. The earl was also appointed to serve at sea for the defence of the realm until Easter and was promised for this purpose the entire income from tunnage and poundage in all the ports of England from Michaelmas to Easter.[2] To Lord Fauconberg fell the important and responsible post of Warwick's lieutenant at Calais.[3]

There was one other person who deserved to be rewarded. The Yorkists recognized their great indebtedness to Coppini, and they were anxious, for their own sakes as well as for his, that he should secure that advancement in the Church on which his heart was set. But Pius II, in spite of the urgings of Francesco Sforza and of Coppini himself, had been in no hurry to grant the cardinal's hat which Coppini had represented as essential for the fulfilment of his great purpose in England. On the other hand, although his predecessors had been wont to support the Angevin instead of the Aragonese cause in Naples, Pius showed no aversion to the league against France which his legate and the Duke of Milan were planning for the benefit of Ferdinand of Naples, and not a symptom of regret on account of the humiliation of Henry VI, who had offended him by not sending a proper embassy to Mantua. In the end, therefore, the Yorkists were given to understand that if the king of England, which was to say themselves, expressed a desire for the appointment of an English cardinal, that desire would be granted and the king of England could nominate Coppini.[4]

---

[1] French Roll 39 Hen. VI, m. 12; Foreign Roll 39 Hen. VI. The warrant for Blount's appointment had been issued on 31st August. Writs of Privy, Seal, file 780. Sir John Neville, who seems to have been lieutenant of the castle of Calais just before Edward's accession (Chancery Miscellanea, bundle 2, no. 50), probably received his appointment also at this time. John Clay had been made victualler of Calais in succession to Nicholas Huse some time before this. Writs of Privy Seal, file 778, 1st Sept.; Foreign Roll 39 Hen. VI.

[2] Writs of Privy Seal, file 780, 10th Dec.; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 642, 652; Close Roll 39 Hen. VI, m. 2.

[3] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 47.

[4] See a letter from the Duke of Milan's secretary to Coppini. *Ibid.*, I, 34.

Consequently, on 9th December, apparently in preparation for the rôle of an English cardinal, Coppini was given a royal license to accept a bishopric in England.[1] The day after Antonio della Torre, whom Coppini described as "my gossip and most faithful friend," and who was about to return to Milan and Rome, was provided with a letter of credence to Sforza, which was signed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Earl of Warwick, the chancellor and treasurer of England, and Lord Berners, and also with a letter from Henry to Pius II in which the king was made to praise the legate for what he had accomplished in England, to say that the affection of the English people for him increased constantly, and to recommend him for preferment.[2]

It may have been true that many of King Henry's subjects loved the legate for what he had done for the Yorkists, but certainly King Henry's helpmate did not. When Coppini, still trying to pose as a peacemaker, took upon himself the task of informing Margaret of Anjou, through Lorenzo of Florence, of the agreement by which her son had been disinherited, the angry and scornful queen replied with a letter which he afterwards described as displaying "too great passion."[3] About the same time, apparently, Margaret received a formal summons in Henry's name to return to London and accept what her husband had accepted.[4] Not only did she refuse, however, to heed this summons, but it was soon discovered that, even before the settlement between Henry and York had been made, she had gone to work, just as her enemies had feared she would, to create an army.

It was first of all to the northern counties of England, where York had few adherents and where the Earl of Northumberland and Lord Clifford had been able to keep the people restless and uneasy,[5] that Margaret looked for aid. But she had other hopes as well. The behaviour of the Scots at the time of the battle of Northampton encouraged her to think that she could obtain assistance from them, and with still greater confidence she looked for help from France, the land of her birth, and from Charles VII, who had profited so greatly through her marriage. For was not the king of France always glad to have a hand in England's internal troubles, and was not Pierre de Brezé, undisturbed by the capture of Doulcereau at Northampton, still ready to use his influence on her behalf? And, indeed, it was not long before Charles gave evidence of kindly interest in his unfortunate countrywoman. To begin with, soon after Somerset retired from Calais to Dieppe, Charles presented the duke with fourteen hundred livres, a gift which enabled Margaret's favourite to get back to England about St. Matthew's Day (21st September) and to establish himself at Corfe Castle, where, being lord of the manor, he had abundant friends and retainers.[1] Better still, when Somerset succeeded by some means in liberating Doulcereau and then sent him over to France, the word Doulcereau brought back to his English friends was that the king of France was not only disposed to assist Queen Margaret himself, but had written to his allies, the kings of Spain and Scotland, requesting them to do likewise.[2]

---

[1] Rymer, XI, 468.
[2] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 35-36.
[3] *Ibid.*, I, 38.
[4] Fabyan, 637.
[5] Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 610, 649, 651.

Charles did, in fact, send a letter to James Kennedy, Bishop of St. Andrews, who at that moment was lying ill at Bruges, urging him to go home to Scotland and exert his influence in favour of Henry VI.[3] But the king of France had worries of his own, not the least of which was the fact that his son and heir was a permanent guest at the court of the Duke of Burgundy.[4] He was all the more inclined to support the house of Lancaster because of Philip's evident friendship for the Yorkists, but he was awake to the fact that, if he made a false step and irritated Philip of Burgundy, the result was likely to be civil war in his own kingdom. For Philip's attitude towards the king under whose suzerainty he held a considerable part of his domains was so far from friendly that, as soon as he heard of the triumph of the Yorkists, he began to cherish a hope, which they seem to have encouraged, that the English would be ready by the following spring to make that descent on the coast of France which figured in Coppini's schemes.[5] And in this hope Louis the Dauphin shared. As early as 6th August Coppini had written to the Duke of Milan that he had reason to believe that in a few days a marriage alliance would be concluded between the Duke of Burgundy and the Yorkists,[1] and although this expectation was not realized, in September one of the Dauphin's officers, Jean d'Estuer, Seigneur de la Barde, arrived in England.

---

[1] Beaucourt, VI, 297, note; Gregory, 209; Davies' Eng. Chron., 99.

[2] Déclaration de M. de Foix sur les brigues pendant la maladie de Charles VII, Commynes-Lenglet, II, 308; Beaucourt, VI, 291, note.

[3] See some instruction afterwards given to Lord Monypenny by the Bishop of St. Andrew's. Waurin, III, 165-166.

[4] Olivier de la Marche says (Mémoires, I, 103) that Louis had obtained an asylum at the Burgundian court partly by threatening that, if it was denied him, he would go over to England and ally himself with the ancient enemies of France.

[5] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 32; Beaucourt, VI, 305.

The Yorkists were so pleased to receive an emissary from the Dauphin of France that they made haste to give the Seigneur de la Barde a safeconduct permitting him to come and go between England and Burgundy as often as he liked during the next three months. They also expressed their gratitude to the Dauphin's host by granting a safeconduct for the Duchess of Burgundy's chamberlain, so that he could come to England to trade for her profit.[2] After this the good understanding between Philip and the Yorkists grew apace, and the duke soon let it be known that he was thinking of sending an embassy to negotiate a new treaty between England and Burgundy. This embassy was to be a very imposing one, as it was to consist of Thibaut de Neufchatel, marshal of Burgundy, Jean, Seigneur de Lannoy, Philip's chamberlain and also his lieutenant in Holland, Zealand, and Friesland, Andrieu Collin, president of the duke's council in Flanders, and Georges de Bull, the duke's secretary; and the chancellor of England issued a safeconduct for it on the very day on which the settlement between King Henry and the Duke of York was announced. Nor did Philip stop with the proposal for a new treaty. He also undertook to checkmate Charles VII, which would mean Margaret of Anjou as well, in Scotland. Simultaneously with the safeconduct for Thibaut de Neufchatel and his colleagues, two other safeconducts were issued by the English Chancery, one for Louis de Bruges, Seigneur de la Gruthuyse, and Jean de Halwin, who wanted to pass through England on their way from Burgundy to Scotland, the other for George Abernethy, provost of the college of Dumbarton, who wanted to come to England to meet Gruthuyse and Halwin and conduct them to Scotland.[3]

---

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 30.

[2] French Roll 39 Hen. VI, m. 13 and 14. The Seigneur de la Barde was afterwards chamberlain to Louis XI and seneschal of Limousin. Lettres de Louis XI, I, 129, note 1.

[3] French Roll 39 Hen. VI, m. 11, 12, 14. This embassy of Gruthuyse to Scotland escaped the notice of his biographer, M. Van Praet (Recherches sur Louis de Bruges, Seigneur de la Gruthuyse), because he trusted to Carte's curiously incomplete catalogue of the French Rolls. It is mentioned by Du Clercq, however. Liv. IV, c. xiv.

The task which Philip of Burgundy had intrusted to Gruthuyse and Halwin was not made easier by the fact that, about the time they reached Scotland, Margaret of Anjou too appeared there. In a moment of discouragement the queen had sent one of her chaplains to France to describe her sad plight to Charles VII and to beg him to send her a safeconduct, so that she and her son could take refuge in France for three or four years or until they were able to recover their rights. Charles and his councillors were far from wishing to see Margaret in France, and although, after much debate, the desired safeconduct was granted on 20th October, the Seigneur de Genlis and Jean Carbonnel, Pierre de Brezé's lieutenant,[1] who were to carry it to the queen, were told to advise her to stay where she was if possible. But before Charles' messengers reached Wales, Margaret's courage had risen again, and she had sailed for Scotland with her son to see what she could accomplish there by a personal appeal. On learning that Margaret had gone to Scotland, Charles sent an embassy to ask the young James III and his mother, Mary of Gueldres, to befriend her and her son in every way they could, and by his ambassadors he also sent Margaret another safeconduct.[2] But to ask others to aid a hapless queen is one thing, to aid her yourself is another, and when, about this time, the Count of Charolais, whose disagreements with his father, as well as his friendship for the Duke of Somerset, led him to favour the Lancastrian cause, made known to Charles that if an army was going to be sent to England to assist Margaret of Anjou, he was willing to take command of it, Charles replied coldly that he had not yet decided to give his support to the queen.[3]

So it turned out that Margaret got nothing better from the king of France than kind words. Nor did her appeal to the king of Scotland bear more useful fruit. As Mary of Gueldres was a niece of Philip of Burgundy and he had arranged and defrayed the expenses of her marriage with James II,[4] the arguments of his ambassadors, seconded by those of Rouge Croix Pursuivant, who made at least two trips from England to Scotland in these days,[5] easily outweighed with her all that Charles VII's ambassadors could say. And if the Bishop of St. Andrews, the leader of those who opposed the queen mother and favoured doing everything possible to strengthen Scotland's ancient alliance with France, was not still detained at Bruges, any attempt which he made to comply with Charles's request that he should help Margaret and her son proved futile. Margaret got no promise of aid from Scotland, and at the beginning of the winter the Scottish army which had been threatening the English border ever since the destruction of Roxburgh and Wark was withdrawn.[1]

---

[1] For Carbonnel's history, see Lettres de Louis XI, X, 213, note 2.

[2] Déclaration de M. de Foix, Commynes-Lenglet, II, 309; Worcester, 774; Beaucourt, VI, 296-297.

[3] Beaucourt, VI, 311.

[4] Olivier de la Marche, II, 52, 117-118.

[5] Warrants for Issues, 39 Hen. VI, 12th Nov.; Issue Roll, Mich. 39 Hen. VI, 27th Oct.

Yet, in spite of all disappointments, Margaret succeeded by hook or by crook in assembling a large army. If foreign aid failed her, at least her English friends did their duty. The Duke of Somerset, the Earl of Devonshire, Sir Alexander Hody, and others were told to gather together their tenants and hasten to Kingston-upon-Hull, the chosen rendezvous, to meet the Duke of Exeter and Lords Roos, Clifford, Neville, Latimer, and Greystock; and Somerset and Devonshire started north early in December with eight hundred men. The duke and the earl went by way of Bath, Cirencester, Evesham, and Coventry to York. There they joined the Earl of Northumberland and Lords Clifford, Dacre, and Neville, who, while waiting for the queen's other friends to gather, had been devastating the estates of the Duke of York and the Earl of Salisbury and recruiting soldiers by threatening loss of life and limb to every man between the ages of sixteen and sixty who did not come and help them to deliver King Henry from the hands of his enemies. Many less important adherents of the house of Lancaster also hastened to Kingston, so that in a short time several thousand men had arrived there, and yet all had been done so quietly that, when rumours of what was happening in the north began to reach other parts of the country, no one would believe them.[2]

Parliament remained in session at Westminster until the beginning of December,[3] but, aside from the settlement concerning the crown and the succession, its proceedings were of little moment. "Ye have many good prayers of the poor people," Margaret Paston had written to her husband, "that God should speed you at this parliament, for they live in hope that ye should help to set a way that they might live in better peace in this country than they have do before, and that wools should be purveyed for, that they should not go out of this land as it hath be suffered to before; and then shall the poor people more live better than they have do by their occupation therein."[1] But the poor people had to wait until quieter days before they obtained the legislation they desired.

---

[1] Buchanan, Bk. XII, c.i.

[2] Gregory, 209-210; Davies' Eng. Chron., 106; Worcester, 774-775; Early Chancery Proceedings, bundle 27, no. 435.

[3] Worcester.

The poor people were not the only persons who would have welcomed help from parliament which they did not get. The Yorkists had no hope of a grant from the Commons, but, without it, they were forced to call for loans, just as their opponents had been forced to do before them. A few friends had advanced some money to them from time to time,[2] but not enough to enable them to make ends meet, and at length the city of London had to be entreated to come to the rescue once more. On 2nd December the common council of London listened to the reading of letters from Queen Margaret, the Prince of Wales, and the Earl of Pembroke but made no reply to them, and a few days later it voted to provide a thousand marks towards the expenses of the campaign about to be undertaken by the Duke of York. As usual, however, London demanded very good security for her money, and in this instance good security not merely for the loan just being made, but also for the repayment of five hundred marks which the Earl of Wiltshire had extorted from the city while he was treasurer of England. If York refused to fulfil these conditions, the city's loan was to be reduced by half, and apparently he did refuse, as five hundred marks was the sum finally received from the city.[3]

On the very day on which the common council granted the new loan to the Yorkists, the officers of the Exchequer received orders from the king to deliver a thousand pounds to the Duke of York, as well as £118 13*s.* 4*d.* "for artillery, gunpowder, and other habiliments of war," and six hundred and fifty marks to the Earl of March—sums which the duke and his son were "to have of our treasury for such charges as been committed to them."[4] And on the following day, 9th December, York, and probably March also, marched out of London.[5] The "charge" which had been committed to March was to go to Wales and raise more men, while

---

[1] Paston Letters, III, 239. "There is great talking in this country of the desire of my Lord of York," Margaret adds. "The people report full worshipfully of my Lord of Warwick."

[2] Receipt Rolls, Easter 38 Hen. VI, and Mich. 39 Hen. VI.

[3] London Journal 6, ff. 279, 280; Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 24th July.

[4] Warrants for Issues, 39 Hen. VI, 8th Dec.

[5] Gregory.

York was to proceed at once to the north to shatter Margaret of Anjou's army. York took with him his son Rutland, as well as the Earl of Salisbury, who had been given a special commission to assist him and authority to arrest and imprison all persons holding unlawful assemblies in the midland and northern counties; and in the wake of his army followed "one called Lovelace, a gentleman of Kent, with great ordnance of guns and other stuffs of war."[1] But the Earl of Warwick, and also the Duke of Norfolk, stayed behind, as Salisbury had stayed behind a few months earlier, to hold and guard London; for, although there was no hostile force in the Tower now, it was not safe to place too much reliance on the Londoners, or at least on their magistrates. However, when, four days after York's departure, Warwick required the mayor and aldermen to call together the wardens of the livery companies and a large number of other citizens and ask them if they were willing to help to protect the king and the city, all protested their readiness to do everything in their power to assist. The common council proved its zeal by ordering that watch should be kept at night in every ward, that the gates of the city should be shut and guarded, and that every person should hang a lantern with a burning candle in front of his dwelling. On the 19th the same council received a letter from the Earl of Northumberland, but, like the letters previously received from Margaret and her son and the Earl of Pembroke, it remained unanswered. Yet that body gave kindly thoughts to King Henry and sent him a Christmas gift of four tuns of the finest red wine and a vat of the finest Rhenish wine, while he rewarded this attention by feasting the mayor and aldermen at the episcopal palace with "great royalty" on Christmas Day, after he had ridden in procession to St. Paul's.[2]

Another task which devolved on Warwick, now as always, was to look after Calais.[3] Further, he had to complete the preparations he had already begun to go to sea to drive back the French, who were now said to be making ready to descend on the Isle of Wight. As the Isle of Wight had been in the Duke of Somerset's keeping for several years past, it was a vulnerable point, and although Somerset himself had now gone north to join Queen Margaret, he had left his brother, Edmund Beaufort, to hold the Isle and, it was feared, to welcome the French. On 16th December, therefore, Geoffrey

---

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 653; Flenley's Six Town Chron., 152.
[2] London Journal 6, ff. 282b, 284, 284b; Flenley's Six Town Chron., *ut sup.*
[3] French Roll 39 Hen. VI, m. 11.

Gate was appointed governor of the Isle, and Warwick sent him to his new post with authority to call out the men of the Isle and of the neighbouring counties in case the French actually attempted to invade England.[1] The French failed to appear, but Gate soon captured Edmund Beaufort and all his sixty-one men and sent them, after a few weeks, to the dungeons of Calais.[2]

York and Salisbury moved northward slowly after they left London, probably in part because they were gathering up additional troops as they advanced, but also in part because the roads were heavy and there were many washouts. For, as if civil war were not enough to bear, it had rained incessantly all the summer through, and incalculable damage had been done in all parts of the country. Meadows and pastures were covered with water; bridges, mills, and dwellings were swept away by the swollen streams, and the crops were ruined. Nothing matured, neither the grain in the fields nor the fruit on the trees—not even the vegetables in the gardens. It was a disaster such as England had not experienced in a hundred years.[3] However, notwithstanding all such hindrances, and also notwithstanding a brief encounter with some of Somerset's retainers at Worksop, in which a few men were lost, on 21st December York and Salisbury found themselves at Sandal Castle, two miles from Wakefield.[4]

Sandal Castle belonged to York, and when he was told that Queen Margaret's army was but a few miles away, at Pontefract, he encamped there and made ready for battle. As Christmas Day with all its sacred associations was at hand, the commanders of the two armies seem to have agreed to a brief armistice, but if the season was too sacred for fighting, it proved to be not too sacred for deceit and treachery. Lord Neville came to York with an offer to raise men for him, and the unsuspecting duke gladly gave him a commission for the purpose, but all the men raised by virtue of that commission went to join the Lancastrian army.[5] Yet that was by no means the worst. Trusting to the armistice, York and Salisbury foolishly let their men wander about the neighbouring country in search of food, and the temptation to take advantage of such carelessness was too great for their enemies' word of honour. Although the armistice had not yet expired, on 30th December, towards evening, when many of the Yorkist soldiers were absent, the entire Lancastrian army suddenly appeared before Sandal Castle. Even then York might have saved himself and at least a part of his army had he been willing to defend the castle until help could come, but his impetuous nature scorned caution and delay, and indignation at the treachery of his enemies also spurred him on. Throwing prudence to the winds, he rushed down the castle hill to meet his foes. The leaders of Margaret's army let him reach the level ground between Sandal and Wakefield and then instantly closed in on him, snaring him "like a fish in a net or a deer in a buckstall." The duke fought like a lion, but all odds were against him, and in a very short time his whole army was routed and he himself lay dead on the field.[1]

---

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 391, 488, 637, 638.

[2] Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 28th July; Issue Roll, Easter 1 Edw. IV, 23rd July.

[3] Whethamstede, I, 381, 384-385; Chron. of John Stone, 78; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 154.

[4] Worcester, 775.

[5] Davies' English Chron., 106. Waurin (II, 260-261) credits Andrew Trollope also with deceiving the duke.

It is said that the Lancastrians killed in the battle of Wakefield numbered only two hundred, the Yorkists more than two thousand. And among those who fell with York were Salisbury's son-in-law, Lord Harington, Sir Thomas Neville, the same earl's son, Sir Edward Bourchier, Sir James Pickering, Sir Harry Radford, and Sir Thomas Parre, while Sir Thomas Harington was so badly wounded that he died the next day.[2] Salisbury himself escaped from the battlefield, but only to meet a worse fate, as he was captured during the night by one of Andrew Trollope's men and taken by the Duke of Somerset to Pontefract. The earl pleaded hard for his life and, on his offering a large sum of money, his plea was granted, but "the common people of the country, which loved him not, took him out of the castle by violence and smote off his head." The Bastard of Exeter, one of two illegitimate brothers of the Duke of Exeter, seems to have been the actual executioner. A few other prisoners were likewise beheaded at Pontefract, among them the mercer Harow, who had taken so prominent a part in Salisbury's siege of the Tower in the preceding summer.[1] But perhaps saddest of all was the fate of the Earl of Rutland. Hall, the Tudor chronicler, gives in a well-known passage a very pathetic account of the death of York's son, " a fair gentleman and a maiden-like person " ; but one may well hesitate to accept the details of Hall's story, since he represents the earl as a boy of twelve, whereas he was really seventeen years of age and therefore, as he lived in the fifteenth century, a man. Only this much is certain: the earl tried to escape but was killed by Lord Clifford's hand—according to William of Worcester, on Wakefield bridge, but according to the story commonly told in Wakefield in the days of Leland, the antiquary, at the door of a poor woman's house which had been shut against him.[2] Yet it is easy enough to believe that when the young earl felt Clifford's clutches on him, he " kneeled on his knees," as Hall says, " imploring mercy and desiring grace both with holding up his hands and making dolorous countenance, for his speech was gone with fear," and that Clifford hissed in reply, as he thrust his dagger into the earl's heart: " By God's blood, thy father slew mine, and so will I do thee and all thy kin."[3]

---

[1] Whethamstede, I, 381-382; Worcester and Davies' Eng. Chron., *ut sup.*; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 154, 171; Cal. Venetian Papers, I, 95. The contemporary chroniclers have left only brief notices of the battle of Wakefield. Hall, whose ancestor, Sir Davy Hall, fought and fell in the battle, gives some details, but they are of doubtful authenticity.

[2] Worcester; Davies' Eng. Chron., 107; Gregory, 210; Warkworth's Chronicle, 42. Hall says that among the slain were two bastard uncles of the Duke of York, Sir John and Sir Hugh Mortimer. But Sir Hugh Mortimer, as a matter of fact, died on 15th May, 1460, leaving a son, John Mortimer, aged three years. Inquisitions *post mortem*, 38 Hen. VI, no. 38.

Margaret of Anjou's lieutenants had won the fight, but in their hour of triumph they forgot that there is wisdom in mercy, especially in civil war, and also that honour is due to a noble foe killed on the field of battle. It was no rabble army, no Cade's rebellion, which had been crushed at Wakefield. Among the slain Yorkists were some of the noblest and most patriotic men of England, and common decency demanded that their dead bodies should be treated with respect. Yet, before their burial at Pontefract, the corpses of the Duke of York, the Earl of Rutland, Sir Thomas Neville, Sir Edward Bourchier, Sir Thomas Harington, Sir Thomas Parre, and Sir James Pickering were beheaded and the heads sent, with those of the Earl of Salisbury and Harow, the mercer, to be displayed on the gates of the city of York. To give greater point to the insult, on York's head, before it was set up on Micklegate Bar, was placed a crown of paper and straw. For this shameful bit of pleasantry, as well as for Rutland's death, tradition holds Lord Clifford responsible.[1]

---

[1] Worcester, Davies' Eng. Chron., and Whethamstede, *ut sup.*; Kingsford's London Chron., 172.

[2] Leland's Itinerary, I, 42. Hall says that a priest named Robert Aspall, whom he describes as Rutland's chaplain and schoolmaster, tried to help the earl to escape, but I have found no other reference to this man.

[3] Hall, 250-251.

Such then was "the field and evil journey of Wakefield,"[2] a calamity of which Nature had given warning by more than one strange token. In Norfolk a two-edged sword pointing towards the earth had been seen in the heavens—an intimation that God was about to wield the sword of vengeance against the people; in Bedfordshire a bloody rain had fallen, to show that blood would soon flow like water; and from other parts of England had come reports of a threefold sun in the sky, a portent of the terrible conflict of the three great potentates of the realm, the king, the queen, and the Duke of York, which had resulted in the captivity of the king and the flight of the queen and now in the death of the duke, the instigator of all the trouble.[3] But if it was York who had brought civil war upon England, his death was not to restore peace. His cause did not die with him and stronger leaders than he remained who were soon to fight even bloodier battles than the one which had sent him out of the world.

Although Chester Herald, in an epitaph written for the dead duke, describes him as:

> "Le puissant duc d'York, Rychart ot nom,
> Prince royal, preudomme de renom,
> Saige, vaillant, vertueux en sa vie,
> Qui bien ama loyaulté sans envie,"[4]

the story of Richard Plantagenet's life shows him to have been a proud and ambitious man rather than a great one—a leader by the chance of birth rather than by strength of personality. For to be a great leader a man must possess, among other qualities, calmness, patience, and self-control, and York was rash, hasty and indiscreet, as he showed by his behaviour after Cade's rebellion, again at the moment when he tried to seize the throne, and still again on the fatal day at Wakefield. The duke's best work was done in Ireland, where, by his policy of good-will towards all, he succeeded in giving that turbulent island a very unusual degree of quiet and in winning the affection of English and Irish alike. In France, on the contrary, his administration was, if not an outright failure, at least not a success; and in England, though his avowed championship of better government and better justice, combined with the reckless folly of his opponents, carried him again and again to the top, he was never able to hold his own for long, not even when the battle of St. Albans made him virtually master of the kingdom. He was no match for Margaret of Anjou, and if this was partly because he was less unscrupulous than she, it was also because he was less clever. Had he escaped with his life at Wakefield, even had he won the battle, Margaret would probably have made herself the ultimate victor.

---

[1] Worcester, Whethamstede, and Kingsford's London Chron., *ut sup.*; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 76, 171; Fabyan, 638; Rolls of Parl., V, 466; Hall, *ut sup.*; Drake, Eboracum, 109. According to Du Clercq (liv. IV, c. xvii.), the paper crown was Trollope's suggestion, while according to the St. Albans chronicler, who hated Margaret of Anjou and all her adherents with a holy hatred, York was taken alive, crowned with a wreath of grass or straw, set upon an anthill, and mockingly saluted as king by his kneeling captors before they beheaded him.

[2] Statute 1 Edw. IV, c. 1.

[3] Whethamstede, I, 385-386.

[4] Political Poems and Songs, II, 256-257.

BOOK II

THE WINNING OF THE CROWN AND THE KINGDOM

CHAPTER I

EDWARD TAKES THE THRONE

THE mantle of the Duke of York fell upon the shoulders of his eldest son, and for two months after the battle of Wakefield, until another great change in his life occurred, Edward styled himself "by the grace of God of England, France, and Ireland vray and just heir, Duke of York, Earl of March and Ulster."[1] The new representative of York's claims was now in his nineteenth year—a brown-haired youth, unusually handsome and pleasant of face, broad-chested, well formed, and so tall that his head and shoulders towered above those of nearly all other men.[2] A contemporary Burgundian chronicler speaks of him as the most beautiful young knight in all England, and Philip de Commynes, after seeing him face to face, declared him to be the handsomest man of his time.[3] But as yet the world knew little about this fine-looking youth. He had played a very creditable part as the Earl of Warwick's assistant during the six months that had elapsed since the landing of the three earls at Sandwich, and probably his genial manner, which in after years made him so popular, had already begun to win friends for him. But his real qualities were still unknown even to Warwick himself, while all that the confident and fluent Coppini ventured to say about him in his letters to Sforza was that he was "young, prudent, and magnanimous."[1]

---

[1] Maxwell-Lyte, History of Eton College, 59.

[2] Polydore Vergil's English History (Camden Society), 172; Hist. Croy. Cont., 532. Du Clercq says (liv. V, c. xviii) that Edward was called "aux longues jambes." And certainly he was very tall, for when his coffin was opened in 1789, his skeleton was found to measure six feet, three inches and a half. Some brown hair, a lock of which is now to be seen in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford, was lying near the skull. Tighe and Davis, Annals of Windsor (London, 1858), I, 396.

[3] Du Clercq, liv. IV, c. xvii; Commynes, I, 207. Commynes was greatly impressed by Edward's good looks. Speaking of the king at the time of his flight to Burgundy, he says that he was not "homme de grand ordre, mais fort beau prince, plus que nul que j'aye veu jamais en ce temps là, et très vaillant"; and when recounting the interview between Edward and Louis XI in 1475, he writes of Edward: "C'estoit ung très beau prince et grand, mais ja commençoit à s'engresser, et l'avoye veu autresfoiz plus beau, car je n'ay pas souvenance d'avoir jamais veu ung plus bel homme qu'il estoit quant monsieur de Warvic le feist fouyr d'Angleterre."

Edward spent Christmas at Shrewsbury, and he was still there when he learned that the evil chances of war had robbed him both of his father and of the brother who had been his playmate at Ludlow. The news filled him with grief and dismay, but, far from despairing, he went resolutely on with his task of raising men.[2] However, less depended on him at this moment than on Warwick, who had London and the king in his keeping, and it was to Warwick that York's friends, even Edward himself, immediately turned for guidance now that their old leader was gone. He is "like another Cæsar in these parts," said Coppini of Warwick,[3] and the description was scarcely an exaggeration. Thanks to his great wealth, to the lavish hospitality he always practised, and to the fame of his exploits at Calais, the earl was so admired, if not loved, that few persons would wish or dare to disobey his commands. Yet, in spite of Warwick's great influence, it was soon to be discovered, if the fact was not already known, that the new mayor of London, Richard Lee, and other prominent Londoners really sympathized with Queen Margaret, and had Warwick had fewer armed men at his beck and call and fewer friends among the people, unpleasant things might have happened when, on the morning after New Year's Day, London learned that the Duke of York had been defeated and killed.[4] As it was, Warwick was able to keep the city under control, and when, on 5th January, he came before the common council, with Viscount Bourchier, Lord Fitzwarine, Lord Rugemont-Grey and others, to ask for another loan for the defence of the kingdom, two thousand marks were at once granted by unanimous consent—with the usual proviso that good security be given. As a further expression of confidence in Warwick, the council also decreed that some of the earl's servants, who had been arrested for attacking the house of one Simon Briggeman outside Bishopsgate, should be set free after they had sworn to behave themselves henceforth.[5]

But there was much to be done besides keeping London faithful. As Margaret would certainly join her victorious troops and lead them southward at the first possible moment, preparations to withstand her must be made and a new army created to replace the one destroyed at Wakefield. Consequently commissions issued in the name of the king and his council were sent off in all directions empowering the king's officers, influential Yorkists, and other individuals to raise men, to arrest persons holding unlawful assemblies, vendors of false news, and other evil-doers, to prevent the unlicensed seizure of castles and the sending of supplies to the enemy, and to put such parts of the kingdom as were amenable to orders in a state of defence.[1] Word was sent to Shrewsbury, for example, that the Duke of Somerset, the Earls of Devonshire and Northumberland, and Lords Roos, Clifford, and Neville had gathered together a large number of homicides, felons, outlaws, abjurors, attainted persons, and other wicked men, who were wandering about the country committing treasons, insurrections, murders, robberies, and other unheard-of crimes; and the town was commanded to repair its fortifications, guard its gates, and make frequent proclamation that, on pain of forfeiture, none of the king's lieges should aid the said lords or their accomplices or obey any orders coming from them.[2]

---

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 69.

[2] Worcester, 775; Kingsford's London Chron., 172; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 76.

[3] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 46.

[4] Fabyan, 638; Flenley's Six Town Chron., 152.

[5] London Journal 6, f. 285; Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 24th July.

As the Earl of March was near by, Shrewsbury probably obeyed to the letter the orders she received, but in some other sections of the kingdom obedience was not so prompt nor complete. An order sent to the escheator of Norfolk and Suffolk to enter and hold Castle Rising seems to have produced only trouble, as one of John Paston's sons wrote shortly after that at that castle and in two other places in the vicinity there was "great gathering of people, and hiring of harness; and it is well understand they be not to the king ward, but rather the contrary, and for to rob."[3]

Warwick had another task to perform. He had to see to it that the calamity at Wakefield did not ruin the Yorkist cause abroad. One of the first things he did after he heard of York's death was to dispatch reassuring letters to Philip of Burgundy, Pius II, and Francesco Sforza. Unfortunately no copy of the earl's letter to Philip is now to be found, but it must have been sent very promptly indeed, as Philip replied to it on 13th January. And the letters to the Pope and the Duke of Milan left London on

---

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 651-658; Close Roll 39 Hen. VI, m. 3; Hist. MSS. Com., Various Collections, IV, 203.

[2] Patent Roll 39 Hen. VI, m. 9 dorso (Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 657).

[3] Paston Letters, III, 266; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 660.

16th January in the pocket of Antonio della Torre, whose departure for Rome with Henry's letter recommending Coppini for preferment had been delayed until now.[1]

Warwick begged Pius not to feel troubled when he heard of the battle which had been fought in England and assured him that, with the help of God and King Henry, " who is excellently disposed," all would yet end well. " We shall obtain either a fair and sure peace or victory," he wrote, " especially if you confer the long expected promotion on your legate. The people will then see that our adversaries, who daily spread lying reports, are false and not true men; for they scorn your authority and the legate's and say the latter has no power and is no legate, adding marvellous falsehoods to make him unpopular, to the detriment of the Church and the king." The legate must be able, the earl told Pius, to bear the legatine cross without exciting the envy and opposition of the two archbishops of England, and he closed his letter with this appeal: " Do not desert me and the others whom you formerly received as sons, for eventually you will see us end well and devoutly. The king sends his recommendations and desires certain concessions which Antonio will declare."[2]

The earl's letter to the Duke of Milan was in the same vein. He urged Sforza to be of good cheer in spite of the news he had probably heard from England and expressed the belief that all could be set right if only the Pope promoted Coppini, as he hoped he would. " The promotion of the legate is indispensable," he declared, " if the Pope mean to aid the state of the Church and our just cause. We are devoted to the Pope and to the commonweal of his Majesty and the realm, which our adversaries endeavour to destroy. They will be prevented from doing so if the expected favour be granted by the Pope."[3]

Thus Warwick strove to soften the news of the battle of Wakefield. But nothing that he could say could really disguise the truth. York was dead and his army routed, and the earl's own strength and determination were all that prevented the utter collapse of the Yorkist cause. Antonio della Torre said frankly, in a letter which he wrote to Sforza on 24th January, that, if help did not come from Rome, Warwick could see no remedy. " And before Easter," he added, " will be ruined the whole of the great

[1] Beaucourt, VI, 323; Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 47.
[2] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 96.
[3] Cal. Venetian Papers, I, 97.

and fine design devised for the honour of God and the estate of the Church and of your Excellency."[1]

Gloomy indeed was the outlook for the Yorkists and for any schemes dependent on their success, and it is striking testimony to the reputation Warwick had won for himself that Philip of Burgundy did not desert him in this dark hour, but waited to see what he could do to redeem the situation. An ambassador from the Duke of Milan, Prospero Camuglio, who came to Burgundy to consult with Philip and the Dauphin Louis before going on to England to negotiate with the Duke of York, was told of the battle of Wakefield and advised not to go to England for the present. Secretly the Dauphin was so discouraged that he began to feel his way towards a reconciliation with his father, and also to open negotiations with René of Anjou with a view to giving his support to the Duke of Calabria in Naples.[2] Yet neither Philip nor Louis lost quite all faith in the league for which Coppini and the Duke of Milan had been working. Apparently the embassy headed by Thibaut de Neufchatel and the Seigneur de Lannoy, for which a safeconduct had been granted in October, had not yet gone to England. But Philip had not abandoned his intention of sending it, and on 26th January the safeconduct was renewed.[3] Three days earlier the Dauphin's agent, the Seigneur de la Barde, who was still with the Yorkists, obtained from them another three months' safeconduct for himself.[4]

Although Antonio della Torre hurried on his way, under the best of circumstances it would be a long time before the cardinal's hat could reach England, and meanwhile Warwick and Coppini must do as well as they could without it. As Coppini's mediatorial efforts had failed when victory was on the side of his friends, they were not very likely to succeed after those friends had been defeated; but as anything which lent an appearance of legitimacy to the present situation had its value, Warwick decided that the legate should again make advances to Margaret. Coppini was not a little troubled by what had happened at Wakefield but, like Warwick, he tried to show a brave face in his letters. "Though the loss and danger are great," he wrote to the Duke of Milan in a letter which

---

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 47.

[2] *Ibid.*, I, 37, 48; Beaucourt, VI, 314.

[3] Rymer, XI, 469. Except that the name of Martin Steenberch is substituted for that of Georges de Bull, this safeconduct is identical with the earlier one.

[4] French Roll 39 Hen. VI, m. 5; Signed Bills, file 1477, 23rd Jan.

Antonio della Torre carried, "yet I am not discouraged, as the Earl of Warwick is safe, with the king's Majesty and with the good will of the people about us." But he also told Sforza in another letter that he had recommended the Yorkists not to give battle at once, but to remain on the defensive until Easter, and that in the meantime he was trying to negotiate an agreement.[1]

Having learned by painful experience how sharp Margaret's tongue could be, Coppini did not run the risk of addressing the queen directly this time, but sent his messages through the friar, Lorenzo of Florence. "Owing to manifest causes and dangers," he told Lorenzo, he was writing to him instead of going in person to the queen and the lords with her. The first thing he bade the friar say to Margaret was that if it was ever found that he had excommunicated or cursed any of her friends, or even consented to such a thing, he would "gladly be flayed alive or torn asunder," for he "excommunicated no one, cursed no one, and wronged no one at any time in this kingdom." He was ready to do all of these things, however, he said, and even more, if he was called upon to do them for the queen; and he declared that all that he had said and done was set forth in the letters which he had published before the clergy and the people and of which Lorenzo was to offer a copy to the queen. "Those who say otherwise about us lie," he continued. "Let them beware of the malediction of the Lord, who, even in this world, often takes vengeance upon the impious. We offer to submit to every imaginable test, and whereas we have heard it said by some that those who were slain at Northampton could not be buried without our leave, this was not our fault, but owing to the opinions of men who considered as excommunicate those who would not yield to our wise and honest counsel and refused to hear us about a treaty of peace."

But the legate was not writing just to defend himself, anxious as he was to prove himself an honest man. He had offers to make and warnings to give. He wanted Lorenzo to tell the queen and the lords with her that there was a chance for an honourable peace, if they did not refuse to listen to his advice as they did before. To the Duke of Somerset, "whom we admire for his character and because we believe that he loves the queen and her estate as we do ourselves," he sent a special warning that if his advice was not heeded, there would be desolation throughout the realm. The

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 43-44.

queen and her friends ought not to be arrogant, he said, on account of the "trifling victory" they had won "owing to the rash advance of their opponents," for the people were incensed against them: first, because the queen's men were said to have committed innumerable acts of cruelty, while the Yorkists had received into favour all who wished to come to them; and second, because the people recognised that the king and the lords with him, and also the legate, really desired an honest and honourable peace. The king, Coppini also asserted, was not "constrained against his free will, as some perverse persons falsely declare," but enjoyed more liberty than in the past, as he himself could testify, since in former days he had not been allowed to approach the king or deliver the Pope's letters to him. Finally, the legate added in a postscript: "Messer Lorenzo, tell those lords not to attach so little importance to my letters because they are of a different effect than has been supposed hitherto, but let them consider the dignity and authority of the Apostolic See, which has sent me here for the reasons we are discussing. If they are dissatisfied or ill-disposed, tell them to reflect that it is better to make peace after a victory than after a defeat, as the wise and prudent Romans did so, and not to account anything as done where there remains so much to do. Let them also consider how much they have to do before they have conquered, and with whom they have to do. Tell them in particular that his Majesty the king, from his experience of my Lord of Warwick and his followers, has determined to protect and defend them to the death, because he never had any [subjects] more loyal. All the people are of the same mind, and they will soon see proof of this. Therefore let them pay heed to what we write, as we offer them a peace to their honour and advantage. I assure you that the means are such that, could we but speak to them in safety, they would approve of them. They are not such as can be put in writing; if you come, you shall see them."[1]

But Coppini was addressing deaf ears. Margaret and her lords did not want a peace by agreement. They were already planning a triumphal march to London, where they meant to deal with the Earl of Warwick as they had already dealt with the Duke of York. King Henry was to be rescued, the Yorkists were to be annihilated, and then the queen and her friends would divide the spoils among them and rule the kingdom again as they saw fit.

---

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 37-41; Cal. Venetian Papers, I, 92-94.

When Margaret went to Scotland, she found, as has been stated, two factions at strife around the throne of little James III—one headed by the queen mother, Mary of Gueldres, who was strongly inclined to do the will of her uncle, the Duke of Burgundy, as it was expounded by the Seigneur de la Gruthuyse, and another headed by the Bishop of St. Andrews, who was ready to follow the wishes of the king of France. Gruthuyse had succeeded in keeping Scotland from giving any aid to the English queen before the battle of Wakefield, but when the outcome of that battle was known, Mary of Gueldres weakened so far as to consent to meet Margaret at Lincluden Abbey. It was said that, during the ten or twelve days the two queens spent together, there was even talk of a marriage between the Prince of Wales and the Princess Mary, sister of James III.[1]

Perhaps it was this marriage proposal, or perhaps it was a still larger bribe, an offer from Margaret to surrender Berwick to Scotland, that finally brought Mary of Gueldres to terms. At any rate, some kind of an agreement was made on 5th January and, immediately after, Margaret hurried back to England to join her victorious army and report the success of her diplomacy in Scotland. The queen was at York by 20th January, and on that day, in her presence, the Dukes of Exeter and Somerset, the Earls of Northumberland, Westmoreland, and Devonshire, the Bishops of Carlisle and Lichfield, Lords Neville, Fitzhugh, and Roos, Sir Thomas Seymour, and Humphrey Dacre, brother of Lord Dacre of Gillesland, bound themselves to "labour by all means reasonable, without inconvenient to the most high and mighty prince," Henry VI, to induce Henry to allow the agreement made at Lincluden to be carried out.[2] But there is reason to think that not all those who signed this promise really approved of the bargain with the queen mother of Scotland, for Lord Fitzhugh and his brother-in-law, Lord Greystock, incurred Margaret's suspicion about this time and had to take a special oath of fealty to her and her son. Nothwithstanding this oath, both of them soon went over to the Yorkists.[3]

As Margaret's thoughts always turned towards France, a signed copy of the promise given by the Lancastrian lords at York was dispatched to Charles VII. And Charles's response was a

[1] Auchinleck Chron., 21, 58; Exchequer Rolls of Scotland, VII, 8, 39, 157.
[2] Basin, IV, 357-358.
[3] Worcester, 775.

proclamation opening all the ports of Normandy to all Englishmen who were Margaret's adherents.[1] For the king of France had every reason to be pleased with the bargain Margaret had made with Mary of Gueldres, since it meant that he had scored a victory over Philip of Burgundy. In February the Seigneur de la Gruthuyse had to return home and report that his mission to Scotland had failed.[2] Yet in spite of this, and in spite of repeated remonstrances from Charles,[3] Philip's determination to keep faith with the Yorkists remained unshaken. And in the meantime the Yorkists seized the opportunity which Charles's proclamation in favour of Margaret's adherents gave them to set in circulation a report that Margaret had entered into an alliance with the French king and had promised him the renunciation of all of England's claims in France.[4]

As Warwick had anticipated, at the first consultation which Margaret held with her friends at York it was agreed to march forthwith to the rescue of King Henry. In a remarkably short time the queen was on her way to London, and with her were the Dukes of Somerset and Exeter, the Earls of Northumberland, Devonshire, and Shrewsbury, Lords Clifford, Roos, Greystock, Fitzhugh, Grey of Codnor, Welles and Willoughby, the redoubtable Andrew Trollope, who seems to have enjoyed the chief command during the march, and an army of Englishmen, Welshmen, and Scots which report said numbered eighty thousand men.[5] But again Margaret forgot that cruelty begets new foes. As her army swept down from the north, all England shuddered and groaned. Fields and dwellings were ravaged and even churches, abbeys, and houses of religion were ransacked for booty, the soldiers carrying off books, vestments, chalices, and church ornaments of every kind, "as they had been Paynims or Saracens and no Christian men." The horrified chronicler of Croyland assures his readers that the ruthless northerners broke open the pixes and threw out the Holy Sacrament, and if the priests or any of the faithful offered resistance, they were murdered in the very church or churchyard. Croyland Abbey was crowded with men and women who fled to it for protection; the most precious possessions of the abbey, including its charters and muniments, were carefully hidden; the entrances were barricaded, and the terrified monks sought by daily processions and nightly prayers and tears at the tomb of the holy Guthlac to ward off the ruin of their home.[1]

---

[1] Chronique Scandaleuse, I, 16; Basin, I, 296-297; Beaucourt, VI, 287, note 5.

[2] On 3rd February Gruthuyse was granted a safeconduct to pass through England. French Roll 39 Hen. VI, m. 6.

[3] Basin, I, 305-306.

[4] *Ibid.*, I, 296-297.

[5] Worcester, 775-776; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 154-155; Waurin, II, 262.

As it turned out, Croyland escaped a visit from Margaret and her army, but Grantham, Stamford, Peterborough, Huntingdon, Royston, Melbourne, and other towns lying in their track were pitilessly sacked.[2] It was the reports of these outrages, more than anything else, which kept London and southern England loyal to the Yorkists. "In this country," wrote Clement Paston on 23rd January, "every man is well willing to go with my lords here, and I hope God shall help them, for the people in the north rob and steal and been appointed to pill all this country and give away men's goods and livelihoods in all the south country, and that will ask a mischief. My lords that been here have as much as they may do to keep down all this country, more than four or five shires; for they would be up on the men in north, for it is for the weal of all the south."[3] So there must have been a prompt and hearty response when, on the 28th, Warwick sent out a warning that "the misruled and outrageous people in the north parties of this realm" were coming "towards these parties, to the destruction thereof, of you, and subversion of all our land," and asked the king's subjects to assemble and resist these foes.[4]

After a while Margaret woke up to the harm which the excesses of her soldiers were doing to her cause, and in a short time London received two letters from her, one written in her own name, the other in that of the Prince of Wales, and both of the same import.[5] We do not doubt that you remember well, ran the Prince's letter in effect, by what deceptions that "horrible and falsely foresworn traitor, Richard, calling himself Duke of York,[1] mortal enemy unto my lord, to my lady, and to us," has blinded my lord's subjects and often provoked them to make unlawful assemblies against his royal estate, while declaring that he intended no hurt, dishonour, or prejudice to my lord's person, but merely sought the welfare of his realm and his subjects. By means of "feigning untrue causes and matters of dislander," the said duke also caused to be slain and murdered divers lords who he thought had knowledge of his intent and meant to oppose him; and now of late, contrary to his allegiance and to the solemn oaths made by him, willingly and uncompelled, at divers times in divers places, he has presumed to put forward "an untrue pretensed claim" against my lord, by which all his venemous purposes at last stand revealed. Yet we are informed that this same false traitor, seeking the utter destruction of my lord and my lady and the disinheriting of us, has recently spread a report that we intend to assemble great numbers of "strangers," with the intent to rob you and other true liegemen of my lord and destroy you forever. But as "God defend that we, rightly and lineally born by descent of the blood royal to inherit the pre-eminence of this realm, should intend the destruction of that city that is my lord's greatest treasure and ours," we trust that when we set out to secure the "enlarging" of my lord, we shall have your help. And we promise you that none of you shall be robbed or wronged by any person coming with us. On the contrary, if any man presume to wrong you, he shall be "so largely punished therefor that other shall take example by him." In the meantime we heartily pray you to guard my lord's person, so that "he take none hurt" through the malice of the said traitors; and we assure you that we will reward you for doing so in such wise that you will have reason to be "largely content."

---

[1] Whethamstede, I, 388-389, 394; Hist. Croy. Cont., 530-531; Davies' Eng. Chron., 109; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 76, 155, 172; Kingsford's London Chron., 172; Rolls of Parl., V, 462, 476.

[2] Three years later the aldermen and burgesses of Grantham petitioned for a confirmation of their liberties and franchises, declaring to Edward IV that his "great rebels coming out of the north country" had taken the charters granted to the town in former days. Signed Bills, file 1492, 8th March, 1463.

[3] Paston Letters, III, 249-250.

[4] Privy Council Proceedings, VI, 307-310.

[5] Margaret's letter has been printed by Mrs. Wood, Letters of Royal and Illustrious Ladies of Great Britain, I, 96-97. The Prince's letter is not in print, but a copy of it, in Stow's handwriting, is preserved in Harleian MS. 543, f. 147b.

But Margaret's acts spoke much louder than her words, and London was still trembling with fear when a piece of very good news was received from the west. The Earl of March had won an important victory.

Edward, with whom were Lord Audley, Lord Grey of Wilton, Sir John Wenlock, Sir Walter Devereux, Sir William Herbert of Ragland and his brother, Sir Richard Herbert, Sir William Hastings, and Humphrey Stafford of Southwick, had been on the point of starting for London, with the troops he had been gathering up on the Welsh border, when he heard that the Earls of Pembroke and Wiltshire had come to Wales by sea "with Frenchmen and Bretons and Irishmen" and were raising men for Queen Margaret.[1] On learning this, the earl at once turned back into Herefordshire and, overtaking the two earls at Mortimer's Cross, near Wigmore, on 2nd or 3rd February, he won a complete victory over them.[2] He seems to have had a much larger army than Pembroke and Wiltshire, but it was not superior numbers alone that gave him the victory. The promptness of his attack had much to do with his success, and he had also been clever enough to turn to good account a curious natural phenomenon which was noticed as he was mustering his men and which was regarded as an omen of some great good or ill. About ten o'clock three suns were seen "in the firmament shining full clear," and when the people marvelled and were aghast, "the noble Earl Edward them comforted and said, 'Be-eth of good comfort and dreadeth not; this is a good sign, for these three suns betoken the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and therefore let us have a good heart, and in the name of Almighty God go we against our enemies.'" Then the earl kneeled down, writes another chronicler, and "made his prayers and thanked God. And anon freshly and manly he took the field upon his enemies and put them to flight."[3]

---

[1] The actual reading in Stow's transcript is "N., calling himself Duke of N."

Edward chased his enemies as far as Hereford and the bloodshed was greater than at the battle of Wakefield, as the dead numbered three thousand or more. The Earl of Wiltshire fled in the very beginning of the battle and the Earl of Pembroke also made good his escape. But Pembroke's father fell into the hands of the pursuers, and as Edward decided to deal with his father's enemies as they had dealt with his father and his father's friends, Owen Tudor, Sir John Throckmorton, and eight other prisoners were beheaded in the market place at Hereford. Tudor's head, writes Gregory, was "set upon the highest grice of the market cross, and a mad woman kemped his hair and washed away the blood of his face, and she got candles and set about him burning, more than a hundred. This Owen Tudor was father unto the Earl of Pembroke and had wedded Queen Katharine, King Henry VI's mother, weening and trusting alway that he should not be headed till he saw the axe and the block; and when he was in his doublet, he trusted on pardon and grace till the collar of his red velvet doublet was ripped off. Then he said, 'That head shall lie on the stock that was wont to lie on Queen Katharine's lap,' and put his heart and mind wholly unto God and full meekly took his death."[1]

---

[1] Worcester, Itinerarium, 327-329; Worcester, Annales, 777; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 76-77; Rolls of Parl., V, 462.

[2] 2nd February is the date usually given for the battle of Mortimer's Cross, but according to Davies' Eng. Chron., and also according to word which reached Prospero Camuglio (Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 57), the battle was fought on 3rd February. Worcester says in his annals that it took place on the vigil of the feast of the Purification, which would mean 1st February; but to judge from a note in his itinerary, it occurred on St. Blase's Day, which would mean 3rd February.

[3] Davies' Eng. Chron., 110; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 77.

The death of the Duke of York had been avenged promptly and thoroughly by his son. More than that, by his victory at Mortimer's Cross Edward had shown himself to be possessed of a remarkable genius for war. While he had done his share to defeat his father's enemies at Northampton, the battle of Mortimer's Cross was the first victory he could claim as his own, the first sample of what his young arm could do without Warwick's help; and it is said that the badge of the sun used by him ever after was adopted in commemoration of the three suns "in the firmament shining full clear" which had foretold his triumph.[2] But the earl had only just won his victory when he who had taught this apt pupil the art of war met with a defeat all but ruinous to the Yorkist cause.

On 8th February Warwick, Lord Bonville, Sir Thomas Kyriell, and Sir John Wenlock were elected knights of the Garter at a chapter of that Order held at the Bishop of London's palace.[3] Perhaps the Garter was an honour which Warwick had long coveted, but while he was engaged in securing it, Margaret of Anjou and her horde of pillagers were drawing nearer and nearer, and there was at least one person in the city who scented danger and preferred to be elsewhere. Coppini decided to go back to the continent. Prospero Camuglio afterwards wrote to the Duke of Milan that, according to report, the reason the legate left England was that he had got himself into trouble with Warwick because he had promised the earl to go into the camp at Northampton and "excommunicate the enemy and give the benediction to the followers of Warwick, but seeing the bad weather and the queen's power, and not feeling well, he did not go."[1] But if this story was true—and it may explain why the legate was able to tell Margaret so emphatically that, nothwithstanding what was said, he excommunicated nobody—at least there was no open rupture between Warwick and Coppini; for when the legate departed, Warwick sent an escort with him as far as Gravesend.

---

[1] Gregory, 211. On the battle of Mortimer's Cross, see, in addition to the chronicles just cited, Ricart's Kalendar, 42; Worcester, Annales, 776; Worcester, Itinerarium, and Rolls of Parl., *ut sup.*

[2] Hall, 251.

[3] Anstis, Register of the Order of the Garter, II, 166-168; Beltz, Memorials of the Order of the Garter, lxvi, clxii.

Coppini embarked at Tilbury for Holland, whence he was to go, later on, to Calais; but the mariners who were to take him to his destination must have concluded that they had a Jonah on board. For their ship narrowly escaped stranding at the mouth of the Thames; on the following day it ran on to a sand bar and was expected to go to pieces; when high tide at last floated it off the sand bar, it was chased by French pirates, and when it got away from the pirates, it was all but destroyed by a storm. But all's well that ends well, and the legate finally landed, safe and sound, if a little shaken in nerve, at Brill, where he was consoled for his recent discomforts by a hospitality as sumptuous as one might enjoy in England itself and where he made haste to perform the vows he had offered up in the midst of the perils of the deep. On 20th February he wrote a letter to his friends in England recounting the mishaps of his voyage and assuring them that he was praying for their prosperity.[2]

Coppini's English friends needed his prayers more than he knew. Considering the outcry caused by the ravages committed by Margaret's army, Warwick ought to have had little difficulty in keeping track of the queen's movements, and yet when, on 12th February, supported by the Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, the Earl of Arundel, Viscount Bourchier, Lords Bonvile, Berners, and de la Warr, and his brother, Sir John Neville, who had just been created Lord Montagu,[3] he led his army and King Henry, its nominal head, out of London, he had no idea that his enemies were already very close at hand. On reaching St. Albans the earl decided to wait for the queen there and, after posting a few men in the town, he fixed his main camp between St. Albans and Sandridge, on a portion of Barnet Heath known as No Man's Land. The usual artillery had been brought along, and in addition the earl had hired some Burgundian gunners, whose small guns would shoot, according to the account of one who seems to have witnessed the battle about to take place, "pellets of lead and arrows of an ell of length with six feathers, three in the midst and three at the other end, with a great mighty head of iron at the other end, and wildfire withal." The camp was protected, also, by several elaborate and curious devices, including caltrops, nets, and shields bristling with nails and provided with "a staff folding up and down to set the shields where they liked and loops with shutting windows to shoot out of."[1]

---

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 60. Gobellinus says: "Legatus non tam in adversis audax, quam cautus in secundis rebus, mortem veritus si remaneret, relicto Varuicio (i.e., Warwick) in Flandriam proper navigavit."

[2] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 53; Cal. Venetian Papers, I, 98.

[3] Neville was made Lord Montagu sometime before 28th January, as he signs himself "J. Montagu" at a meeting of the council held on that day. Privy Council Proceedings, VI, 310.

Margaret reached Dunstable, about twelve miles from St. Albans, on 16th February. There a little band of men led by a butcher of the town tried to stop the way, but they were easily defeated and the butcher, taking his failure much to heart, hanged himself soon after.[2] From Dunstable the queen pushed on rapidly towards St. Albans by a night march, and at three o'clock in the morning, on Shrove Tuesday, 17th February, she gave Warwick an unpleasant surprise.

Warwick had sent out scouts, but as yet only one of them had returned, and as that one reported the queen to be still nine miles away, the earl, thinking he had plenty of time to prepare for her reception, decided to make a slight change in his position.[3] The result was that at the moment the queen's army appeared everything was in confusion in the Yorkist camp. The archers who had been stationed in the town did good work, for they drew up near the market cross and poured forth such a deadly volley of arrows that the queen's men had to turn about and retire to the west end of the town. But this momentary success counted for nothing in the long run. Finding it impossible to penetrate through the market place, the queen's men passed through the fields north of the town and so came out on the farther end of St. Peter's Street, the street leading directly from the market place out to the heath where Warwick's main army lay. In St. Peter's Street they had another sharp and bloody skirmish with the Yorkists, but they finally managed to push through to the heath. There they encountered still more Yorkists, who met their attack with such fierce bravery that for a time it looked as if Warwick would win the day. But apparently the curious guns the earl had brought with him proved more dangerous to the men who fired them than to the enemies they were expected to annihilate, and as the main body of the army failed to come to the support of those who were fighting so stoutly, courage began to flag. Then occurred a disaster not unlike the one which had befallen the Yorkists at Ludford. Least of all, probably, did Warwick look for betrayal from his Kentish soldiers. But Lovelace, the gentleman of Kent who had conducted York's ordnance to the north just before the battle of Wakefield and who was now in command of a band of Kentishmen in Warwick's van, "favoured the north party," as he had been captured at Wakefield by the "northern men" and, to save his life, had taken an oath never to fight against them. Waurin declares that Lovelace revealed to Queen Margaret before the battle "toute la conduite" of the Yorkist army, and if this is more than the truth, at least the Kentish captain now went over to the queen and took his men with him. At the same time some of Warwick's other men became unruly, and so, partly through Lovelace's treachery and partly through the general disorder in the Yorkist ranks, Margaret won the battle. The whole Yorkist army scattered and fled, fled over hedges and ditches, through woods and fields, brambles and swamps, until night fell and gave those who had not already been chased down a chance to escape. And Warwick fled with his men.[1]

---

[1] Gregory, 213. The writer says that "the substance of men of worship" did not have a very high opinion of this novel ordnance and "therefore it is much left, and men take them to malls of lead, bows, swords, glaives, and axes." "As for the spearmen," he adds, "they been good to ride before the footmen and eat and drink up their victual, and many more such pretty things they do, hold me excused though I say the best, for in the footmen is all the trust."

[2] *Ibid.*, 212; Worcester, 776.

[3] Gregory says the Yorkists "pitched a field and fortified it full strong, and, like unwise men, broke their array and field and took another."

The Dauphin of France was told by one who was present at the second battle of St. Albans—probably the Seigneur de la Barde himself—that King Henry had been left by Warwick under a tree a mile away and that there he laughed and sang while the battle raged.[2] If the events of the last few months had unhinged Henry's mind again, it is not surprising. But either he or someone who had been left in charge of him had wit enough to send one Thomas Hoo to Margaret, as soon as the Yorkists had fled, to tell her that her husband was near. Hoo sought out the Earl of Northumberland, who immediately sent some lords to fetch the king, and soon Henry had the joy of embracing his wife and son in Lord Clifford's tent. When the first greetings were over, Doctor John Morton, the Prince of Wales's chancellor,[1] brought forth "a book that was full of orisons" and the king blessed his son and knighted him. Then the little Prince, who was resplendent in a suit of brigandines covered with purple velvet "i-beat with goldsmith's work," and whose badge, a band of crimson and black with ostrich feathers, every man in the queen's army had worn that day, knighted in his turn about thirty men, including the Earl of Shrewsbury, Lord Roos, Thomas Tresham, Speaker of the last parliament,[2] and Robert Whitingham, who for several years past had been the Prince's receiver general and also keeper of the great wardrobe to Queen Margaret[3] and who had even another claim to a reward, as he had been at Guines with the Duke of Somerset. But the very first person honoured by the Prince was Andrew Trollope, who had stepped on one of Warwick's dangerous implements of war and "might not go for a caltrop in his foot." "My lord," said Trollope modestly, "I have not deserved it, for I slew but fifteen men; for I stood still in one place and they came unto me." "But," he added proudly, "they bode still with me."[4]

---

[1] Davies' Eng. Chron., 107-108; Gregory, 212-213; Whethamstede, I, 390-394; Kingsford's London Chron., 173; Fabyan, 638; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 155; Waurin, II, 263-266. The St. Albans chronicler attributes the defeat of Warwick's men to their lack of endurance, and their lack of endurance to the fact that they were southerners!

[2] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 55.

From the battlefield Henry was taken to the abbey, where he was received by Abbot Whethamstede, now old and infirm and trembling for the safety of his people and his beloved abbey, and then led, with hymns of praise and thanksgiving, to the high altar, to the shrine of St. Alban, and, finally, to the chamber which he had always occupied when visiting this hospitable monastery. Even before the king reached his chamber, the old abbot found an opportunity to entreat him to forbid plundering under severe penalties, and the king readily granted the petition. But the soldiers claimed that Queen Margaret and the northern lords had promised them, in lieu of wages, that south of the Trent they might seize anything they could lay their hands on, and they paid no heed to the king's orders. Both town and abbey were thoroughly pillaged. Not even the beggars were spared.[1]

---

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 323.

[2] Son of the William Tresham, also a one-time Speaker, who was murdered after Cade's rebellion.

[3] Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 323, 429.

[4] Whethamstede and Kingsford's London Chron., *ut sup.*; Gregory, 214 Worcester, 776.

If a statement which the Bishop of Exeter made in a letter to Coppini is to be believed—and Warwick's brother ought to have known the truth, if anyone did—the second battle of St. Albans was nearly as bloody as the battle of Mortimer's Cross. Almost three thousand lives, the bishop said, had been sacrificed; and according to those who dug the graves and buried the dead, by far the greater part of those who had fallen were Yorkists. But it was not the makers of the war who had perished. Among the dead were only two men of rank and note, and both of them had fought for Margaret. They were Lord Ferrers of Groby and Sir James Luttrell. Among the prisoners taken were Warwick's brother, the new Lord Montagu, Lord Berners, Lord Bonvile, Sir Thomas Charleton, Sir Thomas Kyriell, and a banner bearer named William Gower. Perhaps Bonvile, Kyriell, and Gower were the men who had had charge of the king during the battle, for Henry had promised them that they should suffer no harm and, relying on this promise, they had allowed themselves to be captured instead of fleeing with their comrades. But, in spite of the king's promise, all three of these men were beheaded two days after the battle. The Prince of Wales, child though he was, was the judge "his own self," and he and his mother witnessed the executions. Lord Montagu would have been beheaded also, it was said, if retaliation had not been threatened against the Duke of Somerset's brother, who was still a prisoner of the Yorkists at Calais.[2]

Margaret and her army were now only twenty miles from London, Warwick's army was defeated and scattered, and Warwick himself had fled—to Calais, it was generally thought.[3] Not one of the Yorkist leaders was in London to urge the city to be true to them, for even the chancellor and Archbishop Bourchier had hastily betaken themselves to Canterbury to wait for better days.[4] But most of the Londoners needed no urging to be faithful to the Yorkist cause. So bitterly did they hate Margaret and all who adhered to her, that after Warwick's departure for St. Albans they had broken into the Marshalsea, dragged out Thomas Thorpe, carried him to Haringey Park, and there cut off his head.[1] The reputation which the queen's army had earned for itself was the very best of reasons for keeping London's gates locked and bolted. Even Margaret herself seems to have been afraid to let her men loose on the city, and she kept them at St. Albans. She merely sent Sir Edmund Hampden, Sir John Heron, and Sir Robert Whitingham to learn the city's "true and faithful disposition," while Sir Baldwin Fulford and Sir Alexander Hody followed as far as Barnet, with four hundred men, to be ready to take possession of the city the moment arrangements for its surrender were completed.[2]

---

[1] Whethamstede, I, 394-396.

[2] *Ibid.*, I, 387; Rolls of Parl., V, 477; Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 51; Gregory, 212; Davies' Eng. Chron., 108; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 76, 172; Worcester, *ut sup.;* Inquisitions *post mortem*, 1 Edw. IV, no. 37 (according to which Bonvile died on 19th February).

[3] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 54.

[4] Worcester. Gregory says the chancellor was among those who fled from the battlefield.

Margaret had some reason to hope for the speedy surrender of London, for while the mass of the citizens were certainly determined to have nothing whatever to do with her, the magistrates of the city were inclined to take a different view of matters. In addition to the enormous sums they had loaned to the Yorkists during the preceding seven months, the mayor and aldermen had had to hand over to Warwick a thousand pounds on 11th February and a thousand marks two days later, besides providing five hundred marks for the "garnishing" and guarding of the city.[3] No wonder they had begun to feel that, by allying themselves with the enemies of Margaret of Anjou, they had merely jumped from the frying pan into the fire. They knew also that resistance to a victorious army had its dangers, and the day after the battle at St. Albans, although strong guards were kept at the gates and the shops were closed for fear of what might happen, they decided to open negotiations with the queen.

The mayor and aldermen chose for their envoys three ladies who were sure to be pleasing to Margaret, namely, the Dowager Duchess of Buckingham, who was the Prince of Wales's godmother, the Dowager Duchess of Bedford, and the widow of the murdered Lord Scales; and they charged these ladies to say to the queen that London's gates would be opened to her if she would guarantee that there would be no pillaging. Some of the aldermen also went out to meet Fulford and Hody at Barnet, and there they seem to have given a promise to send Margaret and Somerset a sum of money and also to admit a certain number of the queen's men into the city on the understanding that the rest of them would be removed to a safe distance. On Thursday, consequently, Margaret withdrew her army to Dunstable. But when, on the following morning, the mayor and aldermen proposed to send the promised money, and also a cartload of food and "Lenten stuff," to Barnet, the citizens seized the cart at Newgate and disposed of its contents. It was Sir John Wenlock's chief cook, Gregory intimates, who was the ringleader in this affair and who carried off the food. "But as for the money, I wot not how it was departed. I trow the purse stole the money."[1]

---

[1] Rolls of Parl., VI, 295; Stow, 414.

[2] Worcester; Gregory, 214; London Journal 6, f. 35b (Sharpe, I, 305).

[3] Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 24th July; London Journal 6, f. 40 (Sharpe, *ut sup.*).

This unpleasant little incident at Newgate did not turn the mayor and aldermen from their purpose. On Friday the three ladies they had sent to Margaret came back with word that, although the king and queen would not say that they would not punish evil-doers, they were ready to promise that the city should not be pillaged. Immediately a proclamation was issued which ordered every one to stay quietly indoors so that the king and his army might enter the city without harm to it. But instead of retiring into their houses, the citizens flew to arms. "They called for a brewer as their leader," wrote one who was in London at the time, "and that day this place was in an uproar, so that I was never more afraid than then that everything would be at hazard." The next day the mayor and aldermen succeeded in restoring quiet by proposing that four of their number, together with the three ladies, should go to Henry and Margaret and suggest to them to send four men to treat with the magistrates in the presence of the people for their entry into the city with the leaders of their army only. But the deputation of ladies and aldermen had scarcely started on its way when an order was sent to the city to proclaim the Earl of March a traitor,[2] and at the same time Fulford and Hody advanced to Aldgate and demanded admission. By this time, however, the mayor had learned his lesson, and he informed Fulford and Hody that never with his consent would they enter London. At that Fulford's and Hody's men began to pillage and plunder, and this so enraged the Londoners that they fell upon them, killed and wounded some of them, and put the rest to flight. Then, more determined than ever that Margaret's army should never set foot within their walls, the citizens took possession of the keys of the gates and refused to let anyone pass out of them. The four men the king and queen had been asked to send arrived on 23rd February, but they had to withdraw without attempting to fulfil their mission, and all that the mayor did in the end was to appoint certain ones to look after the safety of the Tower and issue a proclamation forbidding anyone to insult Hampden, Heron, and Whitingham, who were still in the city.[1]

---

[1] Gregory, 214-215; Worcester, 776-777; Davies' Eng. Chron., 109; Kingsford's London Chron., 173; Fabyan, 638; Hearne's Fragment, 285.

[2] London Journal 6, f. 13; Rolls of Parl., V, 466.

William of Worcester says that if Margaret had marched to London immediately after her victory, the city must have submitted to her. As it was, the Londoners had time to gather up courage to resist not only the queen, but also their magistrates. Nevertheless, so many alarming rumours were afloat and the future looked so dark, that the Duchess of York hurried off her sons, George and Richard, to the court of the Duke of Burgundy. At the same time several other persons, including Thomas Vaughan, William Hatclyf, formerly physician to Queen Margaret and one of the five surgeons who had watched over Henry in the days of his insanity,[2] and Philip Malpas, a wealthy London draper whose house had been plundered during Cade's rebellion and whose nerves had probably never recovered from the shock, embarked in a ship of Antwerp for Ireland and took with them, it seems, some of the royal funds. The Duchess of York's sons reached their destination in safety and were very hospitably received by Philip of Burgundy, but the ship of Antwerp was chased and captured by a French boat, whose master, finding that he had taken a valuable prize, held Malpas for a ransom of four thousand marks and Vaughan and Hatclyf for other large sums.[3]

The kingdom was " convulsed on every hand " by " that unlucky battle of St. Albans," wrote the Bishop of Salisbury to Coppini some weeks after the event, and there were few who did not feel that their heads were in danger. Many of the nobles who sought safety in flight, the bishop said, were prevented by the common people, " who may have thought they would procure peace for themselves by the heads of such great men " ; and of those who got away, " some of our side, as we have recently learned, most unfortunately fell into the hands of enemies or of pirates, with a great quantity of the treasure of the realm."[1] It was not only persons occupying high places or possessing large fortunes who trembled in these days of waiting for no one knew what. A quaint illustration of the doubt and fear felt even by lesser men is furnished by the suit which one William Keynes, a brewer and a dweller in St. John's Street, subsequently brought for the recovery of certain goods against his fellow citizen, Thomas Trebolance, a grocer, "otherwise potecary," who resided "beside the Stocks." "After the field late broken beside St. Albans," stated Keynes in his petition to the chancellor of England, when he was "afraid for robbing by the late rebels that then were resorting toward this city to rob and spoil, like as they robbed and spoiled in other places," he met the said Trebolance "beside the Standard in the Chepe," where they talked together about "the trouble and fear then being." In the course of the conservation Trebolance stated that he had seen one Barowe, then in Ludgate, who had offered to allow him and his friends to put portcullises on their doors with his name under them "as servant to the Duke of Somerset";[2] and he promised that if Keynes would bring some of his goods to him, he would keep them safe "by the means abovesaid." On the Thursday and Friday after the battle of St. Albans, consequently, Keynes, relying on his friend's kind promise, took certain jewels of gold and silver, which he valued at £74 10*s.* 8*d.*, to the house beside the Stocks, where Trebolance, in the presence of his wife, received them and again promised to keep them safe. Nevertheless, a month later, when all fear of Queen Margaret and her robbers had past and Keynes wished to reclaim his property, Trebolance took sanctuary in St. Martin's-le-Grand and his wife ran off with the jewels.[3]

---

[1] See Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 49-51 ; London Journal 6, f. 35b ; and the chronicles cited above.

[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 147, 339 ; Privy Council Proceedings, VI, 223.

[3] Davies' Eng. Chron., 109-111 ; Kingsford's London Chron., 174 ; Fabyan, 638-639 ; Hearne's Fragment, 284.

London's persistent refusal to receive Margaret, even without her army, is the more surprising because at one time it was reported that Warwick, and the Duke of Norfolk also, had fallen into the queen's hands.[4] But luckily there was no truth in this story, which may have been only one of Margaret's fabrications. Warwick had not even fled back to Calais, as his enemies supposed, but had gone westward and soon joined the Earl of March and his troops, flushed with their recent victory at Mortimer's Cross. Edward had started for London as soon as he heard of the disaster at St. Albans, and it was at Chipping-Norton that Warwick met him.[1] On Friday, 27th February, just ten days after Warwick's ignominious defeat, the two earls reached London, and the gates which had been locked against Queen Margaret flew wide to receive them. All the city was glad and said: "Let us walk in a new wine yard, and let us make us a gay garden in the month of March with this fair white rose and herb, the Earl of March."[2]

---

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 63.

[2] The portcullis was the emblem of the castle of Beaufort in Anjou and was used by the Beauforts as a badge.

[3] Early Chancery Proceedings, bundle 27, no. 38.

[4] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 51.

The return of March and Warwick to London was the signal for Margaret's departure. She went back to York, taking with her "that puppet of a king," as the Bishop of Exeter described Henry when writing to Coppini, her three prisoners, Montagu, Berners, and Charleton, and such of her soldiers as had not deserted her. But if Margaret had to retreat without accomplishing all she had set out to do, at least she had won a great victory over Warwick, had rescued her husband, and had given some of her friends a chance to join her. Viscount Beaumont, son of the Viscount Beaumont who fell in the battle of Northampton, Lords Hungerford and Lovel, Sir Anthony Woodville, and, most important of all, Sir John Fortescue had all succeeded in making their way to her side.[3] And as she marched back to the north, she again left ruin in her wake. Her "northern men, as they went homeward, did harms innumerable, taking men's carts, wains, horses, and beasts, and robbed the people and led their pillage into the north country, so that men of the shires that they passed by had almost left no beasts to till their land."[4]

Edward and Warwick had come back to London with their minds made up to take a momentous step. Now that Henry was in Margaret's hands again, only two courses of action lay open to them. They must either give up the struggle and depart from England or they must depose Henry and set up another king. If it was true that they had opposed York's wish to take the crown, that had been because they feared the people would not tolerate such a betrayal of Henry. But now the situation was changed. The outrages of which Margaret's soldiers had been guilty during the last few weeks had estranged more hearts from the house of Lancaster than all the years of misgovernment that had gone before, and the behaviour of the Londoners since the battle of St. Albans had shown that they at least would sooner part with Henry than receive Henry's wife again. The only question, therefore, was the method by which Henry should be deposed. Now that his father was dead, Edward, by acknowledgment of parliament, was already heir apparent to the throne and Henry king only by sufferance, and had parliament been in session at this moment, Henry's deposition would probably have been brought about by another farcical proceeding similar to the one which had procured the agreement between Henry and York four months before. But parliament was not in session, and as it was imperative that whatever was to be done should be done without delay, Edward and Warwick resolved to secure what they wanted by an appeal to their soldiers and the Londoners. So on Sunday afternoon, 1st March, when many of the soldiers and citizens had gathered in St. John's Field, the Bishop of Exeter, who by this time had recovered his courage sufficiently to return from Canterbury and resume his duties as chancellor, went out to address them. He explained the Earl of March's title to the throne and then, when he had read "certain articles and points that King Henry had offended in," namely, his failure to keep the agreement made with the Duke of York in the last parliament and his mental unfitness to rule the kingdom, asked his hearers whether the king was worthy to rule over them still. At once they shouted 'Nay! Nay!' But when he asked them if they wanted the Earl of March to be their king, they shouted 'Yea! Yea!' And thereupon "certain captains" were sent to Baynard's Castle to tell the young earl that the people had chosen him for their king, "whereof he thanked God and them."[1]

---

[1] This is according to William of Worcester. Gregory says the meeting took place at Burford.

[2] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 54; Gregory.

[3] On the question of when Fortescue joined Margaret, see Scofield, Eng. Hist. Review, April, 1912, pp. 321-323. Beaumont, Hungerford, Lovel, and Sir Anthony Woodville all fought for Henry and Margaret at Towton.

[4] Davies' Eng. Chron., 109.

Two days later, when all the Yorkist leaders met at Baynard's Castle for consultation, it was decided that the final step should be taken at once, and proclamation was made in the city summoning all the people to St. Paul's at nine o'clock on the following morning. The next day, therefore, "with the lords in goodly array," Edward went in solemn procession to St. Paul's and, at the Cross, listened to a sermon by the chancellor which was generously besprinkled with Latin phrases and which admonished him and those about to become his subjects to be faithful and true, to beware of "the false subtlety of the Devil and of his false blind workers, with the which he deceiveth many a man and woman both in body and soul," and to "eschew the great vengeance that shall fall for sinful wrongs done in old time by disinheriting of kings, princes, and lords of noble progeny in many divers kingdoms."[1] After delivering these admonitions, the chancellor set forth once more Edward's right to the throne, and when he again demanded of the people, as he had done in St. John's Field, if they would have the earl for their king, they shouted, as before, 'Yea! Yea!' Then the procession passed through the city and out to Westminster, the Londoners, at the chancellor's invitation, following after.

---

[1] Kingsford's London Chron., 173-174; Worcester, 777; Fabyan, 639; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 173.

At the great hall of William Rufus Edward alighted and, on entering, went "up to the Chancery," where, before the Archbishop of Canterbury, the chancellor, and other lords spiritual and temporal, he took his oath, swearing to keep the realm truly and justly and to maintain the laws. After that he was arrayed in royal robes and a cap of estate and "went and sat in the seat as king"; and when with his own lips he had explained his right to occupy that seat and the people had again been appealed to and had again shouted 'Yea! Yea!' he walked through the palace to the Abbey. There the abbot and the monks placed in his hands the sceptre of that King Edward of long ago who had founded their abbey and who now ranked among the holiest of the saints, and afterwards he was led to the high altar and to the Confessor's tomb to make his offerings. From the tomb Edward returned to the choir and, after taking his seat on the throne, once again expounded his hereditary title to the crown, whereat the people, appealed to for the fourth time, shouted that he was their rightful king and all the lords who were present knelt before him, paying homage to him as their sovereign. Finally, *Te Deum* was sung, more offerings were made, and then Edward, after he had changed his "array," went back to the city by boat and dined and lodged at the episcopal palace. On the following day *Te Deum* was sung again at Westminster Abbey and the new king was proclaimed in the customary places in London, while letters missive were hurried off to all parts of the realm to announce that the fourth day of March was to be regarded as the first day of the reign of King Edward IV.[1]

---

[1] Archæologia, XXIX, 128-130.

The Bishop of Exeter, when relating to Coppini the events of 4th March, declared that the Earl of March had been "practically by force created king by the nobles and people universally."[2] In reality it was only the capital of the kingdom and his own soldiers that had acclaimed Edward. How far the rest of England would approve of what had been done in London remained to be seen. And even in London there were some who did not share altogether heartily in the rejoicings. Mayor Lee and the aldermen were troubled in mind by the memory of their attempt to negotiate with Margaret and, supported by a deputation of citizens, they sought the new king's presence and begged him to be good and gracious to their city and to confirm its ancient liberties and franchises as his progenitors had done. This Edward immediately promised to do, but he was careful to command Lee to see that the city was "well guided" and that it remained loyal to him after he set out, as he meant to do at once, in pursuit of the late king and his consort.[3]

[1] Whethamstede, I, 404-408; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., Worcester, Kingsford's London Chron., and Fabyan, *ut sup.;* Flenley's Six Town Chron., 161-162; Hearne's Fragment, 285-286; Records of the City of Norwich, I, 286.

[2] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 61.

[3] Kingsford's London Chron., Fabyan, and Flenley's Six Town Chron., *ut sup.*

CHAPTER II

THE BATTLE OF TOWTON AND THE CORONATION

LIKE all kings of England since Edward III, Edward of York assumed, from the day he seized the throne, the triple title of "King of England and of France and lord of Ireland," although he had still to win the allegiance of a large part of England, although Ireland never submitted willingly to any English king, and although the only part of France over which he could hope to rule, until he had reconquered by war what Henry VI had lost, was Calais and the small pale adjoining it. There was even a third kingdom to which Edward might lay claim some day, even if he did not do so now, to wit, the kingdom of Spain. For he was a descendant of Peter the Cruel of Castile through the marriage of Peter's daughter Isabella with Edmund Langley, Duke of York, son of Edward III. It was true that some seventy odd years ago John of Gaunt, the husband of Isabella's older sister, had failed in an attempt to wrest the Castilian crown from the bastard Henry of Trastamara. It was also true that the present king of Spain, Henry the Impotent, represented the legitimate as well as the bastard line, as John of Gaunt finally gave the hand of his daughter Katharine, the only living offspring of his marriage with Constance of Castile, to Henry of Trastamara's grandson and Henry the Impotent was a descendant of that marriage. But Henry the Impotent had only one child, a daughter, and a daughter of doubtful legitimacy. It was quite possible, therefore, that a day might come when the great-grandson of Isabella of Castile and Edmund Langley could press his claim to the crown of Spain with fair prospect of success, and a Yorkist poet thus addressed Edward IV on his accession to the throne of England:

> "*Re Angliae et Franciae*, I say,
> It is thine own, why sayest thou nay?
> And so is Spain, that fair country.
> *Edwardus Dei gratia.*

"Fie on slothful countenance!
Where conquest is a noble plesaunce,
And registered in old remembrance.
Edwardus Dei gratia.

"Wherefore Prince and King most mighty,
Remember the subduing of thy regaly,
Of England, France, and Spain truly.
Edwardus Dei gratia."[1]

Certainly this was an ambitious programme for a king not yet out of his teens! But for the present Edward had no time to think of foreign conquests. First of all he must reduce England itself to submission.

On 6th March, partly to justify what he had done and partly to call his subjects to arms, the new king issued a lengthy proclamation.[2] "He that directeth the hearts of all princes," he said, He "by whose disposition we been born the very inheritor of the crowns and royal estate of the realms of England and of France and the lordship of Ireland," had caused him to remember the loss of France and the lamentable state of England itself, the oppression of the people and the crimes perpetrated against them, the "decay of merchandise, wherein rested the prosperity of the subjects," and the overthrow of justice, "the mother of virtue." All of these wrongs were due, Edward claimed, to the negligence, ambition, and covetousness of those who had ruled the kingdom; and it was to remedy them that he had taken possession of the crowns of England and France. With the aid of the lords of the blood and of his true subjects, he would do his utmost, he promised, to restore the two realms to their "noble fame, honour, and prosperity"; and he charged all men to look upon him as their sovereign lord. At the same time he gave his orders. It was well known, he said, that the Dukes of Exeter and Somerset, the Earls of Devonshire and Northumberland, Lords Roos, Welles, and Neville, and many other men, their accomplices, had been "moved and stirred by the spirit of the Devil" to destroy the realm of England and its people. To this end, with a great number of rebellious and riotous persons, they were now riding through the country committing many horrible treasons, insurrections, and robberies—robberies even of churches and houses of religion, from which they took both "temporal goods and such as were dedicate and hallowed unto God, as books, chalices, vestments, and all other ornaments." They were also cruelly oppressing "wives, widows, maidens, women also of religion, and other," and murdering and maiming men "in such detestable wise and cruelness as hath not been heard done among the Saracens or Turks to any Christian men." It was also well known, the king continued, that "our adversary, he that calleth himself King Henry the Sixth, contrary to God and to his surety and promise made to such lords and other persons as by his commandment went with him to the field, now late ungodly, cruelly, and unmanly suffered certain of them to be murdered and destroyed." And for this reason, and because the said "rebels and rioters" forced him by their malice to defend the people and the kingdom, Edward forbade anyone, on pain of death and forfeiture, to give help or comfort in any way to Henry VI or any of his adherents, to obey any proclamations or messages coming from anyone but himself, or to "pass over the water of Trent towards our said adversary or any of his adherents" without special license.

---

[1] Archæologia, XXIX, 130. Compare some verses in Hardyng's Chronicle, 413, 418-419, the most interesting of which runs thus:

"To Casteil and to Lion also ye been
Thenheritour also and verie heire
By right of bloodde discended clere and clene
Of Portyngale, wher Lusshborne is full faire,
Fro kyng Petro without any dispeir;
For tho twoo bee the verie regions
That named be Castile and Legions."

In a fifteenth century manuscript in the Bodleian Library, MS. Digby 196, there is a genealogical table showing the descent of Edward IV from Edward III of England and Peter, king of Castile and Leon, the compiler's purpose evidently being to prove that Edward was *verus heres* of Castile and Leon as well as of England.

[2] Close Roll 1 Edw. IV, m. 38 dorso.

Edward's proclamation also contained a warning against the two enemies he had put to flight at Mortimer's Cross, the Earls of Pembroke and Wiltshire, who, by Henry's command, he declared, had brought into England "our enemies strangers, as well Frenchmen as Scots," and were now trying to do the same thing again. This was a danger that would stir every English heart, and, on the strength of it, Edward called on every man between the ages of sixteen and sixty to come to him in his best array, according to the laws and customs of the land, while to emphasize further the contrast between his mode of conducting war and Margaret of Anjou's, he added a command that no man, on pain of death and forfeiture, should rob or take any man's goods against his will, "nor rob nor spoil any church or person of the Church, priest, clerk, monk, canon, or any other religious person," and that, on the same penalty, no man should "deflour[1] or oppress any woman, maiden, wife, or widow, nor do any violence or hurt unto them."

---

[1] *Devoure* is the actual reading in the manuscript.

Finally, addressing himself to Henry Auger, John Copildike, Edmund Yns, John Maners,[1] and other captains and officers of the fleet which was to follow his army to the north and prevent Margaret of Anjou from escaping to France,[2] Edward gave orders that when his proclamation was read to the men of the fleet, the prohibition against crossing the Trent should be omitted and for the last clauses, concerning pillage and rapine, should be substituted a paragraph announcing that "grace and pardon of his life and goods" would be granted to any adherent of Henry VI who tendered his submission within ten days, except twenty-two men mentioned by name and all other persons having lands and tenements worth a hundred marks or more a year. The twenty-two men mentioned by name were Andrew Trollope, William Grimsby, Everard Digby, William Fielding, Thomas Fitzharry, Otis Cornwall,[3] Doctor Morton, Gervase Clifton, Thomas Tunstall, Henry Lowys, knight,[4] Thomas Parker of the Forth, Thomas Everingham, John Danet, "both Bastards of Exeter,"[5] Master Hugh Payn, Thomas Langton, Henry Beaumont, William Bellingham, Alexander Hody, Henry Tudnam, and —[6]Clapham the Younger. The king added that whoever would "effectually destroy and bring out of life" Andrew Trollope, the Bastards of Exeter, William Grimsby, Robert Whitingham, Thomas Tresham, Thomas Fitzharry, and Clapham the Younger should have a hundred pounds. But there were three persons whom the king took under his special protection, for every man was charged, on pain of death, not to rob or trouble any of the tenants of Lord Dacre of Gillesland, Sir Ralph Grey, or John Witherington.[1]

---

[1] Auger had helped to equip fleets for Henry VI. Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 403, 494. Copildike, or else his son of the same name, seems to have been bailiff of Winchelsea at this time and later mayor of Sandwich. Maners was a Norfolk or Suffolk man. *Ibid.*, pp. 193, 281, 358. Yns is mentioned frequently in the Household Books of John, Duke of Norfolk.

[2] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 57.

[3] Grimsby, who was a Lincolnshire man, had been treasurer of the chamber to Henry VI. Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 360. Both he and Digby, who was from Rutlandshire, were attainted by Edward's first parliament, but their attainders were reversed in 1472. Rolls of Parl., VI, 17, 22. Fitzharry fought against Edward at Mortimer's Cross and there was a report after the battle, which seems to have been incorrect, that he had been killed or beheaded. Worcester's Itinerarium. Otis, or Otto, Cornwall of Hereford, gentleman, was granted a pardon in April, 1462. Pardon Roll 1-6 Edw. IV, m. 21.

[4] Sir Henry Lowys, or Lewes, had married Elizabeth, youngest daughter of Edmund Beaufort, Duke of Somerset. Dugdale, II, 124.

[5] William and Thomas, sons of John Holland, Duke of Exeter. *Ibid.*, II, 81.

[6] *Sic* in MS.

The day before this proclamation went forth, the Duke of Norfolk hurried home to raise men in a county where the people were now so ardently in sympathy with the Yorkists that, even before they were sent for, they were arming themselves and getting ready to go up to London; and the day after it was issued the Earl of Warwick left London with "a great puissance of people." Later on Warwick was to meet the king in the north, but in the meantime he was to array the men of the western and midland counties and arrest and imprison rebels. One of the first feats which he seems to have accomplished was to capture and execute at Coventry Thomas, Bastard of Exeter, probably the very man who had beheaded the Earl of Salisbury at Pontefract.[2]

But just as in the days at Calais, what the Yorkists lacked was not men but money, and most of the soldiers who had followed Edward to London from the Welsh marches had done so at their own expense.[3] Little money was likely to flow into the Exchequer at Westminster while one part of the kingdom was in open rebellion and the rest of it in a state of more or less disorder, and although the property of the Lancastrian lords was now being seized, just as in former days the property of the Yorkist lords had been seized, the valuable estates thus drawn into the king's hands probably brought him little revenue which was immediately available.[4]

[1] It is not easy to see why the tenants of Lord Dacre and Sir Ralph Grey were to be spared, as Dacre certainly and Grey probably fought for Henry VI at Towton. Paston Letters, III, 268; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 160; Cal. Venetian Papers, I, 106.

[2] Paston Letters, III, 265-266; Hearne's Fragment, 286; Fabyan, 639; Kingsford's London Chron., 175; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 156; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 31; Cal. Venetian Papers, I. 99. The day before he took the crown, Edward had written to Coventry to thank the citizens for aid sent to him and to charge them to suffer none of his rebels to enter their town. Coventry sent forty men north with Warwick and later, apparently, sent sixty more who helped to win the battle of Towton. On 13th May, from York, Edward sent the town another letter of thanks. The Coventry Leet Book, II, 314-319.

[3] Gregory, 215.

[4] In Enrolled Accounts, Escheators' Accounts, London, 39 Hen. VI-1 Edw. IV, 75/53, there is an interesting list of articles which were seized in the Earl of Northumberland's London house and turned over to the treasurer of the king's household. The list includes "one pan of brass set in furnace," one standing bed, two joined forms, a table, several trestles, a cupboard, a chair, and three stools. But the Countess of Northumberland, to whom, as she was Edward's aunt, some generosity must be shown, was permitted to keep a stone mortar with a pestle, eight dishes and eight saucers of pewter, three brass pots, two brass caldrons, a brass pan, a pair of iron racks, two iron spits, an iron frying pan, four mattresses, and two bolsters.

So again the Yorkists had to borrow. Once more appeal was made to the mayor and aldermen of London, and partly because they could not refuse and partly, perhaps, because they hoped that gratitude would wipe out the memory of their dealings with Margaret, they advanced four thousand pounds to Edward IV before he had been king four days.[1] Nor was this all that was asked of the mayor and aldermen. Between 4th and 13th March they seem to have contributed nearly one hundred and fifty pounds towards the expenses of the royal household, which had been promptly organized with Sir William Hastings as chamberlain, John Fogge, now become Sir John Fogge, as treasurer, and John Scott, also now a knight, as comptroller.[2] In addition, Hugh Wyche, who was soon to become mayor of London, loaned the king a hundred pounds, and five hundred marks were obtained from the prior and convent of Holy Trinity, the richest priory in London. The Bishop of Exeter, too, generously raised some money for the king by pledging some of his jewels to a London grocer, jewels which he never saw again, as the grocer put them in a barrel on board a ship for delivery to certain persons in Calais and while the ship lay in the harbour at Sandwich, some pirates boarded her and helped themselves to the contents of the barrel.[3]

George Neville could well afford to lose a few jewels for the new king's sake, for he had been ordained chancellor of England again the day after Edward took the throne and, three days after Warwick left London, he was formally installed in office and renewed his oath in the tower of Baynard's Castle.[4] As the last ministers and officers of Henry VI had been appointed by the Yorkists, they were all retained by the new king. Viscount Bourchier continued to be treasurer, Stillington keeper of the privy seal, and Sir John Wenlock chief butler,[5] while Warwick himself kept the office of great chamberlain, which had fallen to him after his father's death,[1] the constableship of Dover Castle and the Cinque Ports, and the captaincy of Calais, to which was now added the captaincy of Guines and Hammes.[2] Lord Fauconberg Edward made "one of our barons of our council" with a salary of a hundred marks a year.[3]

---

[1] Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 24th July.

[2] Household Accounts, 1 Edw. IV, in Accounts, etc. (Exchequer K. R.), bundle 411, nos. 11 and 12.

[3] Writs of Privy Seal, file 782, no. 3; Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 17th July; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 10, 35.

[4] Rymer, XI, 473; Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 15th Feb.—a warrant to pay the Bishop of Exeter his salary for attending the king's council which begins with these words: "Forasmuch as we, the iiijth day of March last passed, ordained and made the Reverend Father in God, our right trusty and well beloved cousin, George, Bishop of Exeter, to be our chancellor of England, taking of us yearly for his fee of attendance to our councils because of his said office CC li." etc. Nevertheless, the bishop drew his salary as chancellor, £500 *per annum*, from 9th March, as the day on which the king actually constituted him chancellor. See Enrolled Accounts 1 Edw. IV.

[5] Bourchier's letters patent bear the date, 18th March. Cal. Patent Rolls,

Edward's ministers enjoyed no sinecure, as there was much hard work waiting to be done. The king was ready to do his full share of that work, however, and Warwick had not been gone from London many days when Edward followed him northward. On Wednesday, 11th March, the "foot people" of the army, mostly Welshmen and Kentishmen, left London under the command of Lord Fauconberg,[4] and at or about the same time Sir John Wenlock set out with a band of men, three great bombards, and a commission empowering him to summon the people of five counties to help him to capture the castle, or manor-house, of Thorpe Waterfield in Northamptonshire, where a few stubborn spirits had gathered and refused to yield.[5] Two days later Edward himself marched away through Bishopsgate with the rest of his troops, and with him went the Duke of Norfolk and also the Seigneur de la Barde, who bore the banner of Louis the Dauphin and led a band of men sent

I, 9. Stillington's wages—both the 20*s.* a day which he received as keeper of the privy seal and the £100 a year which he was paid for attending the council—began on 1st November. Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 17th Feb.; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 149. Between 4th March and 1st November he must have held his office by virtue of the king's mandate *ore tenus*, as John Clay held the office of victualler of Calais from 4th March to 1st August. French Roll 1 Edw. IV, m. 18. Wenlock's letters patent are dated 1st May, but the warrant for them was issued on 16th April. Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 8; Writs of Privy Seal, file 782, no. 39.

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 641.

[2] The letters patent bestowing these offices on Warwick for life are dated 7th May. Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 45; French Roll 1 Edw. IV, m. 24. But technically he held the captaincies of Calais and Guines from 3rd March, 1461, the last day of the reign of Henry VI. See Exchequer Accounts, France, bundle 196, no. 4. He was careful, when he was appointed captain of Hammes, to obtain definite relief from all responsibility for the castle until it had been reduced to submission.

[3] Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 31st Oct.

[4] Hearne's Fragment, 286; Fabyan, 639.

[5] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 28. See also Issue Roll, Easter 1 Edw. IV, 23rd July and 20th August, from which it appears that Wenlock was allowed £252 2*s.* for the expenses of himself and his men at Thorpe Waterfield and other places from 17th March to 15th May. On 1st May Thorpe Waterfield was granted to the use of Edward's sister, the Duchess of Exeter. Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 7. At the time of the siege it probably belonged to Lord Lovel, as it had been a part of the inheritance of Maud de Holland, who married the John, Lord Lovel, of Edward III's reign. Bridges, Hist. and Antiquities of Northamptonshire, II, 364-367.

by Philip of Burgundy in testimony of his friendship for the house of York.[1] But before the king departed, one Walter Walker, grocer, who had been guilty of making light, as it was thought, of the new king's title to the throne, was beheaded in Smithfield as a warning to other doubting Thomases. According to Jean de Waurin, the axe fell also on the neck of Lovelace, the man who had betrayed Warwick at St. Albans. Lovelace had been captured and brought to London, Waurin says, and in his confession he stated that Queen Margaret had promised to give him four thousand pounds and make him Earl of Kent.[2]

Edward and Warwick had accomplished much since Warwick's flight from St. Albans, but Margaret of Anjou had been equally busy, busy gathering up new troops and busy spreading evil reports of her enemies. Now fully aware that the outrageous behaviour of her army had been the real cause of her failure after the battle of St. Albans, the queen was anxious to prove to the world that her enemies were as bad or worse than she was, and although Edward's accession proclamation had so strictly forbidden pillaging or violence of any kind, she started the story that "our great traitor, the late Earl of March, hath cried in his proclamations havoc upon all our true liege people and subjects, their wives, children, and goods."[3] As of old, too, Margaret had been looking abroad for help. Not content with the assistance Scotland was giving her, she had been appealing to Charles VII again; and she had also been trying to reach the ear of the Pope. She hoped, by telling Pius the truth about his legate's doings in England, to secure the transference of the papal sympathy and support from her enemies to herself.

Brezé's man, Morice Doulcereau, had been with Margaret at St. Albans, as he had been with Henry at Northampton, and the moment her great victory was won—a victory which she felt must immediately convince every one of the weakness and impending downfall of the Yorkists—the queen sent him and a couple of Dominicans over to France.[1] Doulcereau, who crossed the sea a little in advance of the Dominicans, arrived in the kingdom of Charles VII within a week after the battle of St. Albans and went straight to Brezé, to tell him that other envoys from Margaret would soon reach France, to beg him to do his best to see that Warwick's fleet was destroyed, and, finally, to whisper in his ear certain secret offers which the queen was ready to make to the king of France. These secret offers must have been of a truly startling character, as Brezé, when writing to Charles, warned him not to attempt to send letters to Margaret by any hands except Doulcereau's, because, if his letters were captured and the queen's intentions discovered, her friends would unite with her enemies and kill her.[2] It is probably safe to conclude that Margaret, who did not hesitate to reward the friendship of Brezé himself with a gift of the islands of Jersey and Guernsey, to be held by him and his heirs independently of the crown of England,[3] was already proposing, as she unquestionably did at a later time, to sell Calais to France. At least it is certain that Philip of Burgundy suspected her of such an intention. For one who was watching events in the interest of the Duke of Milan wrote on 23rd March that the king of France was assembling men and ships in Gascony in the hope, it was believed at the Court of Burgundy, that he would get Calais through the favour of the queen of England.[4]

---

[1] Privy Seals; Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 61, 64; Gregory, 216; Basin, I, 301-302; II, 231-232. Philip's support was undoubtedly a great boon to the Yorkists, but Chastellain goes rather too far when he claims (VII, 218) that the duke "promut luy seul le roy Édouard à la couronne d'Angleterre, et à son moyen le fit seoir en royal throsne." This seems like robbing the Earl of Warwick!

[2] Fabyan, 639; Kingsford's London Chron., 175; Stow, 415; Waurin, II, 270-271.

[3] Plumpton Correspondence, I, lxvii.

When Margaret's other envoys, the two Dominicans, arrived at the French court, one of them, who was on his way to the papal court to present the queen's complaints against Coppini and the English prelates siding with the Yorkists, merely asked for letters of recommendation to the Pope and the cardinals. This request Charles readily granted. But the other Dominican asked for far greater favours. The subject of Calais Margaret would mention only by the mouths of Brezé and Doulcereau, but through the Dominican she besought Charles to loan her eighty thousand crowns, to send a fleet to attack the Yorkists, to revoke all safeconducts that had been granted to their adherents, and to send her, on her promise to pay the ransoms for which they were held, certain Englishmen captured at sea—meaning, no doubt,

---

[1] Déclaration de M. de Foix, Commynes-Lenglet, II, 309.

[2] See a letter written by Brezé on 24th February. Basin, IV, 358-360.

[3] Falle, An Account of the Island of Jersey (edited by E. Durell, Jersey, 1837), 55; Beaucourt, VI, 328.

[4] Dispatch of Prospero Camuglio, Beaucourt, VI, 326-327.

Malpas, Vaughan, and Hatclyf. To these entreaties Charles made answer that his expenses had been so heavy during the year that he was unable to raise the money the queen desired; that he could not in honesty revoke the safeconducts already granted, although he would give orders to the admiral of France not to grant any more to the enemies of Henry VI; and that while he would see to it that the prisoners Margaret referred to were safely guarded, they could not be given up without the consent of their captors. In regard to one matter, however, the king was more obliging. He promised that a fleet should be made ready to assist the queen and that Brezé should have command of it. Nevertheless, when the Dominican introduced the subject of a treaty of alliance, Charles remarked that it would be time enough to talk about that when Henry VI had recovered his throne and subjugated his enemies. What he did now, he said, was done solely out of regard for the duty which one king owes to another and for the blood relationship existing between Henry, Margaret, and himself.[1] If Calais tempted him, as it could hardly fail to do, he probably told Brezé that he would be ready to bargain on the basis of its surrender when there was a better chance of Margaret's being able to hand the place over to him. And as it turned out, Margaret was never to have the power, if she had the will, to give away England's last bit of territory in France.

Although Charles VII consented to help Margaret at sea, and although René of Anjou began to form an army to be sent to her support,[2] the fate of the house of Lancaster was to be decided before either king could intervene.

Probably because Warwick had to be given time for his errand in the western and midland counties, Edward moved without haste after he left London. On 16th March he was at Barkway, only forty-five miles from London, and on the 17th he reached Cambridge, where Sir John Howard met him with a timely contribution of a hundred pounds which the abbot and convent of Bury St. Edmund's had sent "by way of love."[3] It was not until Friday, the 27th, or Saturday, the 28th, before which time both Warwick and Fauconberg had joined him, that the king passed through the town of Pontefract and reached Ferrybridge, a little way beyond. At Ferrybridge he was stopped by the discovery that the bridge across the Aire had been destroyed by the army of Henry and Margaret and that their army was now waiting for him about eight miles beyond the river, between the villages of Saxton and Towton. Eager to meet his enemies, Edward at once set some of his men to work building a new bridge, but a rough structure had scarcely been completed when, on Palm Sunday morning, at daybreak, Lord Clifford, by a sudden and unexpected attack, succeeded in capturing it. A sharp fight followed this mishap in which Lord Fitzwalter received his death wound and Warwick himself was slightly wounded in the leg by an arrow, but in the end Clifford was driven back and slain not far from the Lancastrian camp.[1]

---

[1] Déclaration de M. de Foix.

[2] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 56.

[3] Privy Seals; Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 28th July and 21st Dec.

The encounter with Clifford caused little delay. While he was being pursued by a part of Edward's men, the rest were making their way across the new bridge, and in the afternoon the entire Yorkist army arrived at the point, close to Saxton, at which the road from Ferrybridge to Tadcaster and York dips down into the little valley known as Dintingdale. The Lancastrians were drawn up just beyond the valley, on a plateau which is about a mile in breadth and drops suddenly on the west to the Cock Beck, a narrow but deep stream, while on the east it extends almost to the Tadcaster road and on the north to Towton and beyond.[2] This was a good position on the whole, but as the Yorkists rushed across the valley and up the slight ascent, a fine sleet began to fall and the wind suddenly shifted in such a way as to carry the storm directly into the faces of their foes. The result was that the archers who had been given the task of holding the ascent against the Yorkists aimed so badly that their arrows did little harm, and Edward and Warwick soon succeeded in getting on to the plateau. Then began a fierce hand-to-hand struggle with swords, daggers, spears, battle-axes, and leaden malls which lasted until ten o'clock at night. "And all the season it snew." At one time the Yorkists seemed to be losing ground, and some of them fled, taking Edward's baggage and supplies with them; but Edward and Warwick rallied their men again and again, and after a time the Duke of Norfolk, who had not been present when the battle began, arrived with some fresh troops.[1]

---

[1] Cal. Venetian Papers, I, 99; Worcester, 777; Gregory, 216; Hearne's Fragment, 287; Whethamstede, I, 408; Hall, 255. Cf. Waurin, II, 275. Hall, who seems to have drawn his facts, if facts they are, from some source unknown to us, says that Fauconberg, Blount, and Horne, having crossed the river at Castleford, chased Clifford to Dintingale, where he fell pierced in the throat by an arrow. The speech which Hall puts into Warwick's mouth is almost a literal translation from Du Clercq, liv. IV, c. xxiv, but the account of Clifford's death does not come from that source. According to Worcester, the skirmish at Ferrybridge occurred the day before the battle of Towton; but the Bishop of Exeter, who undoubtedly had seen the letter sent by Edward to his mother immediately after the battle, told Coppini that it took place at daybreak on Sunday.

[2] For a description and map of the battlefield see an article by C. Ransome in Eng. Hist. Review, July, 1889.

It was probably Norfolk's arrival which broke the courage of the Lancastrians, for at a moment when the Yorkists almost despaired, their enemies gave way and fled pellmell along the road towards York. A large number of men seem to have been drowned where the road, after descending a steep hill, crosses the Cock Beck, and at Tadcaster, where the Lancastrians had foolishly broken the bridge over the Wharfe, the same thing happened. Many of the other fugitives were overtaken on the road and slain —so many that from the site of the battle to the walls of York blood mingled with the melted snow and ran in rivulets through the ruts and furrows of the road.[2] And again some of the blood that was spilled was the noblest of the land, as the battle of Towton took almost as heavy a toll from the Lancastrian nobility as the battle of Wakefield had taken from the Yorkist nobility. The Earl of Northumberland, Lords Dacre of Gillesland, Neville, Welles, and Mauley all fell on the battlefield or in the flight towards York. And so, too, did Andrew Trollope, "miles strenuissimus et fortissimus," who was such a hero in the eyes of his contemporaries over-sea that Basin, the historian of the reigns of Charles VII and Louis XI, gives him all the credit for the Lancastrian victories at Wakefield and St. Albans and among all the victims of the battle of Towton mentions him alone by name![3]

---

[1] Hall says that Norfolk was not present at the beginning of the battle because he had "fallen sick."

[2] Whethamstede, I, 409-410; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 173-174; Hist. Croy. Cont., 533; Hearne's Fragment, *ut sup.;* Cal. Venetian Papers, I, 99-102; Hall, 256.

[3] Basin I, 299. Cf. Du Clercq, liv. IV, c. xxiv. Waurin thrusts Trollope into the foreground on all occasions. It is worth noting that Warwick, on the contrary, did not always get credit for bravery. Adrien de But (Coll. de Chroniques Belges inédites), when describing, incorrectly, the battle of Towton, makes this interesting statement: "Quasi miraculose igitur victoria cessit Edwardo, qui, duce de Warwyc fugiente, cum pauco numero suorum et Theutonicorum descendebat pedes pugnare, scissis ab anteriori parte, prout moris est nobilium deferre, rostris calceamentorum." In order to appreciate this last realistic touch, it must be remembered that this was the period when the pikes or points of the shoes were worn so long that they often had to be tied to the knee with chains or silk laces.

While so many noble Lancastrians perished, the Yorkists lost no men of note except Robert Horne, one of the three captains who had admitted Edward, Warwick, and Salisbury to Canterbury on their arrival from Calais, and John Stafford, probably a kinsman of Humphrey Stafford of Southwick. But Lord Fitzwalter died a week later of the wounds he had received at Ferrybridge, and Lord Scrope of Bolton also was severely wounded.[1] The Yorkists took some prisoners, but this time King Henry escaped. Henry, Margaret, and the Prince of Wales had remained in York while their troops advanced to meet the Yorkists, but the moment they heard that their army had been routed, they fled towards Scotland; and the Dukes of Exeter and Somerset, Lord Roos, Lord Rugemont-Grey, Sir John Fortescue, Sir Humphrey Dacre, Sir Edmund Hampden, Sir Robert Whitingham, Sir Henry Bellingham, and Sir Richard Tunstall, Henry's chamberlain, either fled with them or joined them a little later.[2]

Without doubt the battle of Towton, or, as it was often called, Saxton Field, York Field, or Palm Sunday Field, was a very bloody one, for on that all authorities are agreed; but it is difficult to arrive at any satisfactory conclusions in regard to the size of the two armies engaged in it or in regard to how many men were killed, as the numbers mentioned by the chroniclers are all too large for acceptance.[3] All that can safely be said is that Henry and Margaret had the larger army and also the larger representation of the nobility. With them were the Dukes of Exeter and Somerset, the Earls of Northumberland, Westmoreland, Devonshire, Wiltshire, and Shrewsbury, Viscount Beaumont, Lords Roos, Clifford, Dacre of Gillesland, Neville, Welles, Willoughby,[4] Lovel, Mauley, and Hungerford, Sir Anthony Woodville (since the death of his father-in-law commonly called Lord Scales), and Sir Henry Stafford, uncle of the young Duke of Buckingham and second husband of Margaret, Countess of Richmond; while with Edward had come only the Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Warwick, Lords Fauconberg,

---

[1] Paston Letters, III, 267; Nicolas, Hist. Peerage, 199, note.

[2] Rolls of Parl., V, 478; Paston Letters, *ut sup.*

[3] The Bishop of Salisbury told Coppini that Edward had nearly two hundred thousand men, and that the killed, not counting those who were drowned, were estimated by the heralds to number twenty-eight thousand. Cal. Venetian Papers, I, 101-102.

[4] Willoughby made his peace with Edward before the year was done and was granted a general pardon on 5th February, 1462. Rolls of Parl., V, 617; Pardon Roll 1-6 Edw. IV, m. 44.

Stanley, Fitzwalter, and Scrope of Bolton, and probably Lords Clinton and Grey of Ruthyn.[1]

Most of those whose lives ended on this sorrowful Palm Sunday were hastily buried in five great pits in a field by North Saxton church, but from this promiscuous grave their bones were removed in after days to Saxton churchyard, where a tomb had already been erected to the memory of Lord Dacre of Gillesland.[2]

Edward shared in the first pursuit of his fleeing enemies, but the day after the battle, while some of his men continued the chase and the dead were being gathered up for burial, he made a triumphal entry into York. His first act at York was to remove from the city gates the heads of his father, his brother, the Earl of Salisbury, and others who had perished at Wakefield and to send them to Pontefract to be buried with their bodies. The second thing he did was far less to his credit. In the castle he found a few of Henry's friends, among them the Earl of Devonshire, who was "sick and might not void away"; and he immediately gave orders for their execution and set their heads upon the gates to replace those which had just been taken down. Nor were these the only executions. York received the victorious king with honour but also with dread, and although Lord Montagu and Lord Berners, who had been left behind when Henry and Margaret fled, interceded for the city and obtained a promise of grace, a few of the more guilty or more obstinate citizens seem to have been made to suffer.[3]

Edward celebrated Easter in York with great pomp and splendour,[4] and he remained in the city nearly three weeks. In the meantime his lieutenants were bringing the surrounding country under control, and what happened at Beverley may be taken as a sample of what happened in many Yorkshire towns. To Beverley came Lord Fauconberg accompanied by Lord Greystock, who had now deserted Margaret for Edward, and there, to judge from the town's records, which make special mention of "the great ship of Lord Warwick," they were met by the king's fleet. Beverley had sent men to Towton to fight for the house of Lancaster, but now, when the conqueror of Henry VI demanded its submission, it could only obey. Fauconberg and Greystock were received with as good grace as was possible under the circumstances, and the town furnished them with bread, fish, capons, and everything else desired. Some of the townsmen were then sent over to York to negotiate with the king's council for a "safeguard for the commonalty," and Henry Auger, one of the captains of the fleet, was given twenty shillings for preventing plundering, while the good-will of "Master Fogge," treasurer of the king's household, who came to Beverley to decide how many armed men the town should be required to send to the king, was sought by a gift of an ambling nag with a saddle and bridle. Fogge's temper having been sweetened by this means, he demanded only twenty-four armed men. But a band of archers had also to be supplied, and when Edward finally departed from York, Beverley's archers and her twenty-four men-at-arms, fitted out with brand new jackets and bearing a brand new embroidered flag, accompanied him.[1]

---

[1] Cal. Venetian Papers, I, 102, 103, 105; Paston Letters, III, 267-268; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 160; Gregory, 216-217; ballad printed in Archæologia, XXIX, 343.

[2] Leland's Itinerary, I, 44; Stow, 415-416; Drake, Eboracum, 111. Richard III began to build a chapel at Towton in which the Yorkist dead were to be interred, but it was never completed.

[3] Cal. Venetian Papers, I, 100, 103; Paston Letters, *ut sup.*; Hearne's Fragment, 287; Gregory, 217-218; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 77; Whethamstede, I, 411. Cf. Du Clercq, liv. IV, c. xxiv, and Waurin, II, 289.

[4] Hist. Croy. Cont., 533; Fabyan, 640.

While most of Yorkshire submitted to Edward without a struggle after the battle of Towton, there was one person in the county who was not easily frightened into docility. John Grenewell, Abbot of Fountains, was so stubbornly faithful to the house of Lancaster that he was arrested and carried to London, where, on 10th July, he had to give a bond of two thousand pounds not to go more than two miles from London or the Abbey of Thame. A month later he was licensed to go where he would south of the river Trent until 4th November, when he must present himself before the king in Chancery. A month later still he was licensed to go anywhere in the realm, after he had again given a bond of two thousand pounds to be a faithful liege and subject of King Edward and his heirs, kings of England. Having been taught his lesson thus thoroughly, the abbot behaved with such discretion from that time on that in the spring of 1464 Edward employed him to prorogue parliament. Yet his last bond remained uncancelled until 7th February, 1471, when Henry VI, then once more occupying the throne of England, informed the keeper of the rolls of Chancery that "Edward, late pretended king," had bound the Abbot of

---

[1] Poulson, Beverlac, or the Antiquities and History of the Town of Beverley (London, 1829), I, 238-242; MSS. of the Corporation of Beverley (Hist. MSS. Com.), 165-166.

Fountains to him in the sum of two thousand pounds, "which recognisance is against our title and our dignity royal and grounded without reason," and commanded the keeper to cancel the bond, so that the abbot would no longer be "vexed or hurted" by it.[1]

Long before Edward left York, London and the southern counties were rejoicing over his success. The first accounts of the battle which reached London said that Margaret and the Prince of Wales and all the northern lords had been either captured or killed;[2] but on 4th April came a letter which Edward, always a good son had written to his mother so soon after his victory that even he was mistaken about the fate of some of his enemies. William Paston, who had the pleasure of reading this letter, summarized its contents as follows: "First, our sovereign lord hath won the field, and upon the Monday next after Palm Sunday he was received into York with great solemnity and processions. And the mayor and commons of the said city made their means to have grace by Lord Montagu and Lord Berners, which, before the king's coming into the said city, desired him of grace for the said city, which granted them grace. On the king's part is slain Lord Fitzwalter, and Lord Scrope sore hurt; John Stafford, Horne of Kent been dead; and Humphrey Stafford, William Hastings made knights, with other; Blount is knight, &c. On the contrary part is dead Lord Clifford, Lord Neville, Lord Welles, Lord Willoughby, Anthony, Lord Scales, Lord Harry, and by supposing the Earl of Northumberland, Andrew Trollope, with many other gentle and commons to the number of twenty thousand. Item, King Harry, the queen, the Prince, Duke of Somerset, Duke of Exeter, Lord Roos, be fled into Scotland, and they be chased and followed, &c." "Item," added Paston, reporting a less important piece of news, "Thorpe Waterfield is yielden."[3]

Immediately after the king's letter was received, the chancellor in person proclaimed the victory at Paul's Cross, and *Te Deum* was sung with solemn pomp at St. Paul's and in all the parish churches of the city.[4] On the following Monday other letters arrived which stated that Henry and Margaret, the Prince of

---

[1] Close Roll 1 Edw. IV, m. 31 dorso, 26 dorso, and 24 dorso; Writs of Privy Seal, file 780, no. 11,077; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 71; Rolls of Parl., V, 500.

[2] Compare the lists in Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 160-161, Paston Letters, III, 267-268, and Cal. Venetian Papers, I, 103-104, 106.

[3] Paston Letters, III, 266-267.

[4] Cal. Venetian Papers, I, 103; Fabyan, 640; Kingsford's London Chron., 175.

Wales, and the Dukes of Somerset and Exeter had been captured. This story was soon contradicted by another, which said that the fugitives had escaped to Newcastle and that Edward had sent an army to besiege the town.[1] A few days later still another story was going about. One of John Paston's friends wrote on 18th April that he had heard that King Henry was at a place in Yorkshire "called Corumber—such a name it hath, or much like," and that Sir Robert Ogle had laid siege to the place and killed three thousand out of five or six thousand men assembled by the late Earl of Northumberland's friends, who had hoped to carry off King Henry "at a little postern on the back side." Some told, he said, that the queen, Somerset, and the Prince were with the king in this place.[2]

There were people outside of England as well as within it who would rejoice over the news from Towton. While so many startling events were happening in England, all sorts of wild rumours had been reaching the ears of the Duke of Burgundy. One of these rumours was that King Henry had been persuaded by the queen and the Duke of Somerset, who were discouraged by London's refusal to admit them after the battle of St. Albans, to abdicate in favour of his son and had afterwards been poisoned by the queen! "At least he has known how to die," was Prospero Camuglio's comment on this story, "if he did not know what to do else." "It is said," Camuglio added, "that the queen will unite with the Duke of Somerset."[3] But the writer was sensible enough to doubt the truth of this story, and soon more trustworthy reports of what had occurred in England were received. For to the Dauphin Louis, and no doubt to Philip of Burgundy as well, Warwick himself wrote an account of what had been done on 4th March,[4] while to Coppini no less than three bishops, the Bishops of Exeter and Salisbury and an Irish bishop, Nicholas O'Flanagan, Bishop of Elphin, whom the legate had sent over to England to promote his schemes, hastened to send news of the new king's success, each of them commenting on the event in his own way and encouraging the legate to return to England.

[1] Cal. Venetian Papers, I, 100, 103, 105,

[2] Paston Letters, III, 269. Cf. Du Clercq, liv. IV, c. xxiv. By "Corumber" was probably meant Carham Castle in Northumberland. See Cadwallader Bates, Border Holds of Northumberland, 429. Ogle was warden of the east march at this time. Rotuli Scotiæ, II, 401.

[3] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 58.

[4] *Ibid.*, I, 57.

The chancellor, after telling Coppini of the terrible carnage at the cost of which the battle of Towton had been won, bemoaned the spilling of so much Christian blood and the wasting in civil war of so much treasure, as well as blood, which ought to have been utilized in supporting the Pope's enterprise against the Turks. But he expressed the hope that peace would prevail in England henceforth and promised to report any further events of importance which might occur. The Bishop of Salisbury, glad to forget that he had once been an opponent of the Yorkists, expressed to Coppini the hope that God, " who has hitherto permitted a sinful race to be scourged with dire strokes under an unhappy prince, being now appeased by our tears and prayers, has at length sent us this saviour" ; and he hastened to state that he had found so much favour in the new king's sight that he had been chosen to be " of the three to whose judgment all the most secret matters of the council are referred." This was greater favour than had ever been shown to him by the preceding king, he said, although he had grown up under Henry "almost from the cradle" ; and he assured the legate that he would use his influence in his interest. The Bishop of Elphin wrote that everything seemed to be turning out well for King Edward, to the joy of everyone, and urged the legate to write as soon as possible to the king, the chancellor, and the other lords, because it would give them pleasure. " Write also," he added, " to the Duchess of York, who has a great regard for you and can rule the king as she pleases. Do not mind making demands, as we shall not fail you so long as I have any power."[1]

But of greater moment than Coppini's feelings about the battle of Towton were those of the Duke of Burgundy. Another letter which the Bishop of Elphin wrote to the legate a few days later shows that, just as Margaret of Anjou had flattered herself after her victories at Wakefield and St. Albans that Charles VII would be glad to enter into an alliance with her, so now Edward, on the morrow of his great victory, was counting with certainty on obtaining a close alliance with Philip of Burgundy. In that matter it was thought the legate's presence in Flanders could be turned to good account. There was a report among the English lords, wrote the Bishop of Elphin, that the Duke of Burgundy was treating King Edward's brothers with respect, and this pleased them wonderfully ; for they believed that a treaty would be signed between the duke and the English and that one of the king's brothers would marry the Count of Charolais' daughter. From the Bishop of Salisbury's remarks he gathered, he said, that the bishop would like to have the duke and his council take the matter up with him in particular as the king's privy councillor.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, I., 62-63, 64, 66-67.

Upon the receipt of these letters from his friends, Coppini immediately sought an interview with Philip and the Dauphin.[2] He also began to make preparations to go back to England; and the reply he sent to the Bishop of Exeter's letter shows how pleased and excited he was. He had received with great joy, he wrote, the letters from England which told him that "the proud have been humbled and the humble exalted" and how a merciful God had granted a glorious victory to "the renowned Edward and the devout sons of Holy Church." He remembered, furthermore, how the bishop and the king, in the last conversation he had with them, expressed their desire to use all their goods and all their strength for the glory of God and the Church and for the dignity of the Pope, and how he replied that without a doubt the Omnipotent God, who knows and understands the heart of man, would defend and protect them. But he was grieved to his "inmost heart," he said, by the shedding of so much blood, although he saw clearly that what had happpened was the work of the Most Just God; and he gave expression to the pious hope that the souls of those "who, with overweening insolence, regardless of all apostolic reverence, threatened to hang the apostolic legate, the true messenger of peace, as your paternity has full well known, threatening also the heads of yourself and of all those who were of the same opinion with us," had not perished with their bodies. "O God, what confusion, what terror, what infamy and insult we all suffered from the vilest men when we left your parts recently after the flight and disaster to your side; while now, on the contrary, when the wind has changed and victory is won, what ignominy and wretchedness have fallen upon them and what glory upon you!" But a brief letter could not contain all that the excited legate wished to say. The rest he must tell the king by word of mouth, he said, when he met him, which he hoped by God's grace would be soon.[3]

But alas for the self-congratulating Coppini and for all his hopes and schemes! By this time Margaret of Anjou's envoy had reached Rome.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, I., 67.
[2] *Ibid.*, I, 81.
[3] *Ibid.*, I, 78-80.

The reassuring letter which Warwick wrote to Pius II shortly after the battle of Wakefield was so long in reaching Italy that Margaret had won her second victory and Edward had been proclaimed king before it was received at Rome. However, news of the battle of St. Albans and of the events of 4th March also travelled slowly to the papal court, and in the meantime Pius had written a brief reply to Warwick and also a letter to Henry VI, whom he supposed to be still in the hands of the Yorkists.

In his letter to Warwick Pius, after acknowledging the receipt of the earl's letter, expressed his grief at the news that some of the earl's kinsmen had perished in battle and his wish that peace and concord might prevail between the lieges of Christ. He was very glad, he said, to see that the earl kept a good courage and assured him that it was unnecessary for him to commend the king to him for his goodness and faithfulness to the Apostolic See, for he loved the king as a father and was ready to do for him all that was consistent with his duty to God. He was also ready he declared to do all that he could for the earl himself. But as for the promotion of the Bishop of Terni to the cardinalate, which he understood the earl desired and considered important for the safety of the realm, that was no light matter. The consent of the cardinals was necessary, and they were not easily persuaded to make an appointment. He promised not to neglect the earl's recommendation, however, when the proper time came, and meanwhile, he said, let the Bishop of Terni do what he could. The bishop is in England as a legate and has the power *de latere*, he told the earl, and time might bring what the earl desired. "We pray God to be favourable to your Grace," were Pius's closing words, "and to bring all of your labours to a successful conclusion."[1]

This letter to Warwick was written on 10th March. The one to Henry was written on the following day, and in it Pius condoled heartily with the king regarding the vexations he had lately suffered and said he grieved that so noble a realm should be for ever scourged with dissentions. "We are well disposed towards the English race, which has great strength for all the greatest deeds," he assured Henry. "We are well disposed towards your Highness, whose goodness is well known and whose devotion

[1] Vatican Transcripts, portfolio 62.

to the Apostolic See is ever praised. We know that you abhor disputes of this kind and are a lover of peace and concord. We would that our actions could avert all trouble that oppresses you. We would do this willingly for you, dear as you are, nor should you fail to receive from us the help of a good father. But since we are far away and can do nothing further, you must bear with a calm spirit every trouble. God sends such tribulations to his servants, testing their constancy by that means; yet he does not desert them or suffer them to fall into dishonour. If you hope in the Lord, all will go well with you; and we urge and beseech you to do so." He offered his good services to the king, however, if there was any way in which he could be of assistance, and promised to do all that he was able in the Lord. He had already written to the Bishop of Terni, he said, "that he is to aid you in every way, help you and, so far as in him lies, not allow you to be harassed. We do not doubt that he will carry out our directions and do what he can, for he is devoted to your Serenity and has always written to us with the greatest good-will and zeal for the state of your crown."[1]

Perhaps the rather cool and non-committal tone of Pius's letters was due to doubt of Warwick's ability to accomplish his purposes after York's death at Wakefield. Or perhaps reports of Coppini's doings which were not as favourable to him as those sent by his Yorkist friends and himself had already been reaching Rome. At all events, as soon as Margaret of Anjou's envoy arrived, Pius was made fully acquainted with the other side of the story, and then, if not before, he began to distrust his legate. Coppini, in consequence, at the very moment when it seemed as if the realization of his splendid dreams was assured, became apprehensive that the necessary backing from Rome was going to fail him. Matters were about to take a change for the better, the legate wrote to the Duke of Milan when forwarding to him the letters from England; and as it was evident that his return would be welcome, he was on his way back to England, where he was ready to do his part and more. But at the same time he told the duke that he must have support, and that he despaired "at seeing such exceptionally glorious things prepared while I am not assisted or understood."[2]

If Coppini despaired, as he said he did, that fact did not put an end to his scheming. Through Prospero Camuglio he suggested to Sforza that he should hire a fleet from Genoa for four months in order to obtain control of the sea for Edward and Warwick and enable them to use all their strength against France. He also urged that Camuglio should be allowed to go with him to England. The great chance had come with the victory of Edward and Warwick, he kept telling Sforza, and everything pointed to success. Even the stars were favourable. He had spoken with some astrologers, and one of them declared that in the summer the king of France would be "in very great danger of death, and if he escapes it will be rather a miracle than the course of nature. The result will be seen about August."[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.*

[2] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 81.

While Coppini was dreaming of an English invasion of France under the victorious banner of Edward IV, Edward was finding plenty to do nearer home. The king ordered the chancellor to join him at York very soon after the battle of Towton and a few days later set out for Durham, which he reached on 22nd April.[2] Lawrence Booth, Bishop of Durham, had been keeper of the privy seal to Henry VI and chancellor to Queen Margaret,[3] but he did not venture to defy the victor of Towton. He welcomed his visitor, and Edward, realizing how desirable it was to win the good-will of the man who ruled over the great palatine bishopric of the north, flattered his host by taking him into his confidence and making him his confessor.[4] The Prior of Durham also anxiously curried favour with the new king. As Margaret had forcibly borrowed four hundred marks from the prior and convent, money they "might never worse have spared in all their days," and as the Earl of Northumberland, now lying dead at Towton, had also had more than twenty pounds from the treasure chests of the priory, the prior hastened to put up a petition to King Edward for the recovery of this money from the priory's debtors, dead or fled away. As the king was leaving the cathedral, "my Lord of Durham took me in his hand," wrote the prior later, "and sat down upon his knee before the king, and so did my Lord of Warwick, and I beside him; and they prayed the king to be my good lord; and the king answered and said, 'Prior, I will be your good lord, and I shall remember your bill.'" But it is to be feared that this was one promise which Edward forgot to keep, as thirteen years later the prior was still striving to recover the money Margaret had taken.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, I, 86, 88. Coppini wrote a similar tale about the king of France to Pius II. *Ibid.*, I, 91.

[2] *Ibid.*, I, 62; Paston Letters, III, 269; Privy Seals.

[3] See an Account Book of the Receiver General of Queen Elizabeth, 6-7 Edw. IV, in Miscellaneous Books, Exchequer T. of R., no. 207.

[4] The Bishop of Durham is given the title of king's confessor in some wardrobe accounts extending from 17th April, 1 Edw. IV, to Michaelmas Eve, 2 Edw. IV. Enrolments of Wardrobe Accounts (Exchequer L. T. R.), roll 6, m. 53-54.

While Edward was at York or at Durham, the Earl of Wiltshire, Doctor John Morton, Sir William Plumpton, and Doctor Ralph Mackerell had been captured at Cockermouth, as they were trying to reach Scotland, and brought to Newcastle, and on 1st May Edward went to Newcastle to deal with them. The Earl of Wiltshire could scarcely hope for mercy from the son of the Duke of York, and he received none. He was beheaded as soon as Edward entered Newcastle and before many days his head was to be seen on London bridge.[2] But the other prisoners were treated less severely. A commission was appointed to hear and determine the treasons and other offences committed by Doctor Morton within the city and suburbs of York, and not long after the doctor was lodged in the Tower of London—a prison from which he must have escaped very soon, as before a year had gone by he was again with Queen Margaret.[3] Doctor Mackerell probably shared Morton's imprisonment and escape, as he too afterwards got away to the queen, but Sir William Plumpton, being a man of property, succeeded in making a bargain and thus avoided the discomforts of imprisonment. He gave a bond to pay two thousand pounds before Pentecost and thereupon was taken under the king's protection. After the expiration of his bond, he surrendered himself at the Tower, but on 5th February, 1462, he was granted a general pardon.[4]

Farther north than Newcastle Edward did not attempt to go, for beyond lay hostile Northumberland, with its forbidding castles, and the Scots. If he could have closed the doors of Scotland against Henry and Margaret, they must have fallen into his hands; but that was what he could not do. Immediately after the battle of Towton he had tried to open negotiations with the ministers of James III or, more likely, with Mary of Gueldres, and his overtures must have met with some response, as on 23rd April he directed the chancellor to draw up a safeconduct for Lord Hamilton and Duncan of Dundas to meet him at Newcastle, Carlisle, or elsewhere.[1] But before that date Henry and Margaret had arrived at Berwick and had easily obtained permission to enter Scotland from the Bishop of St. Andrews, who had Linlithgow Palace put in readiness to receive them and afterwards procured a more permanent abode for them in the Dominican convent at Edinburgh.[2]

---

[1] Raine, The Priory of Hexham, I, cii-cvi. Cf. Correspondence, Inventories, etc., of the Priory of Coldingham (Surtees Society), 191.

[2] Paston Letters, III, 268-269, 271; Gregory, 217-218; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 161; Privy Seals.

[3] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 30; Gregory, *ut sup.*

[4] Worcester, 781; Plumpton Correspondence, lxvii-lxviii. Cf. Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 177. Mackerell is described as parson of Risby in Suffolk. Rolls of Parl., V, 477.

The moment he learned that his rival had been made welcome in Scotland, Edward dispatched a letter to King James in which he demanded that "Harry, late usurpant king of our realm, Margaret, his wife, and her son, and other our traitors and rebels" should be surrendered to him unless they had already become James's subjects.[3] But there was little chance that his demand would be heeded, as by this time Margaret of Anjou had again broached the subject of a marriage between her son and James's baby sister and now at least, if not before, had definitely offered to place Berwick in the hands of the Scots, if she was granted what she wanted. When Philip of Burgundy heard that Henry and Margaret were in Scotland, he too was alarmed. The duke hastened to send the herald of the Seigneur de la Gruthuyse to Mary of Gueldres with letters in which he again entreated her not to consent to the Lancastrian alliance, and the Dauphin Louis also did what he could to prevent such an outcome.[4] But all was in vain. The great lords of Scotland were so averse to the marriage Margaret proposed that they accused the Bishop of St. Andrews, its chief advocate, of being ready to send Scotland to perdition to please the king of France,[5] but Berwick was a bribe which even Mary of Gueldres could not resist. On 25th April Berwick was surrendered to the Scots in Henry VI's name, and soon Mary of Gueldres had the

---

[1] Cal. Documents relating to Scot., IV, 267; Rotuli Scotiæ, II, 402.

[2] Lesley, 34; Major, Bk. VI, c.xix; Exch. Rolls Scot., VII, 49. Lesley's list of those who came to Scotland with Henry and Margaret is so incorrect that it is a curiosity.

[3] Halliwell, Letters of the Kings of England, I, 125. Edward's letter is without date, but there is little doubt that it belongs to the days immediately following the battle of Towton.

[4] Beaucourt, VI, 337, notes 4 and 5; Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 90, 94. Cf. Du Clercq, liv. IV, c.xxiv, Waurin, II, 302-304, and Buchanan, Bk. XII, c. 3, all of whom seem to confuse the earlier visit of Gruthuyse himself to Scotland with this journey of his herald.

[5] See some instructions which the bishop afterwards gave to Lord Monypenny. Waurin, III, 166.

Prince of Wales in her household and was making loans to Margaret.[1]

Although what had actually happened in Scotland was bad enough, even worse things had been feared. At one time, probably while he was at Durham, Edward had written to his friends in London that on the preceding Thursday Margaret of Anjou had granted seven "sheriffwicks" of England to the king of Scots, had promised James that her son should marry his sister, and had bestowed the archbishopric of Canterbury on the Bishop of St. Andrews, other English bishoprics on other Scottish prelates, and the estates of English noblemen on divers Scots and Frenchmen. Worse still, she had bound England as far as she was able, Edward declared, to join the ancient league between Scotland and France. In return for all this the Scots had given their oath to support Henry and her and were now getting ready to lay siege to Norham Castle on the following Friday.[2]

Although Edward's letter closed with an announcement of his intention to resist "the great presumption and customable pride of the said Scots," he was not called upon to go to Norham, as the expected attack did not take place. After spending twenty-four hours in Newcastle, he left the town in the keeping of Lord Fauconberg, who was now in command of the fleet, and Tynemouth in charge of Sir George Lumley, and then went back to Durham.[3] But the danger from the Scots was not past, and it was decided that, while Edward returned to London for his coronation, Warwick and Montagu should stay behind to hold the north in subjection and to prevent Margaret from leading another army into the heart of the kingdom.

Before he went back to London, Edward turned westward to make his power felt in Lancashire, Cheshire, and Staffordshire. Preston, Warrington, Manchester, Chester, Stafford, and Eccleshall all received brief visits from him, and after that he stopped at Lichfield, Coventry, Warwick, Daventry, and Stony Stratford.[4] At Stony Stratford he spent two days, and during those two days he probably rode over to Grafton-Regis, the home of Lord Rivers, as he did on a famous occasion three years later; for just before he started on his way again, he sent word to the chancellor that "of our grace especial" he had "pardoned and remitted and forgiven unto Richard Woodville, knight, Lord Rivers, all manner offences and trespasses of him done against us" and had also granted him the enjoyment of all his goods and chattels. Who can doubt that a pair of bright eyes which Edward IV had just seen, probably for the first time, the eyes of Elizabeth Woodville, widow of the Lord Ferrers of Groby who had been killed in the second battle of St. Albans while fighting for Margaret of Anjou, had pleaded for a father's pardon? Perhaps the same eyes had asked for a brother's pardon, too, as Sir Anthony Woodville, Lord Scales, also received a pardon and a grant of all his goods a little more than a month later.[1]

---

[1] Rolls of Parl., V, 478; Exch. Rolls Scot., VII, 62, 76, 80, 85, 139.

[2] Halliwell, Letters of the Kings of England, I, 123-125.

[3] Privy Seals; Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 30th August (a warrant for making certain payments to one John Twyer, with Twyer's bill for corn, etc., shipped to Fauconberg enclosed) and 4 Edw. IV, 4th June. Cf. Issue Roll, Mich. 1 Edw. IV, 26th Nov. and 30th Jan.

[4] Privy Seals.

On leaving Stony Stratford Edward proceeded to Shene (Richmond), which he reached on the same day, 12th June,[2] and there he probably had the pleasure of greeting his brothers, George and Richard. For he had sent to Burgundy for his brothers as soon as his hold on the throne seemed secure; and after the city of Bruges had given them a farewell banquet and Philip of Burgundy had showered gifts on them, the two lads had been escorted to Calais by a guard furnished by Philip and thence had crossed to England, to be regaled with delicacies by the city of Canterbury and then journey on to London.[3] However, unpleasant things as well as pleasant ones met Edward at Shene. Parliament had already been summoned to meet on 6th July, and it was intended that the coronation should take place six days later, on Relic Sunday.[4] But now the king learned that serious events were happening in distant parts of his kingdom.

---

[1] Writs of Privy Seal, file 783, no. 113, 12th June; file 784, no. 252, 20th July. Rivers's pardon passed the great seal on 12th July, Sir Anthony's on 23rd July. Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 97. Rivers's younger son, Sir Richard Woodville, seems to have had to wait until 8th February, 1462, for his pardon. Pardon Roll 1-6 Edw. IV, m. 39.

As Sir Thomas More heard the story, the first meeting between Edward and Elizabeth Woodville came about through her petition for the restoration of the lands her late husband had given her in jointure. More, Hist. of Rich. III, 59.

[2] Privy Seals.

[3] Du Clercq, liv. IV, c.xxiv; Gilliodts-van-Severen, Inventaire des archives de la ville de Bruges, V, 531; Chron. of John Stone, 83; Hist. MSS. Com., Report 9, app., 140.

[4] Reports on Dignity of Peer, IV, 950; Paston Letters, III, 286; Hanserecesse, II, 5, p. 60.

To begin with, the king of France, living up to his promise to Margaret of Anjou, had been assembling a fleet at the mouth of the Seine, and now that fleet had descended on the island of Guernsey and the French were laying siege to Castle Cornet in order that Pierre de Brezé might become master of the islands Margaret had granted him.[1] Castle Cornet seems to have resisted its attackers successfully, but the stately castle of Mont-Orgueil, on the neighbouring island of Jersey, by the negligence, if not connivance, of its English commander, John Nanfant, was seized by a Frenchman named Floquet and handed over to Brezé's lieutenant, Jean Carbonnel. Although Philip de Carteret, Seigneur de St. Ouen, kept the French out of the six western parishes of Jersey, in Mont-Orgueil and the eastern half of the island they entrenched themselves so firmly that it looked as if they could never be expelled.[2]

The attack on Jersey and Guernsey caused great excitement and set many rumours afloat. To the ears of Prospero Camuglio, then at Bruges, came a report that twenty thousand Frenchmen had embarked in Normandy and were going to the gulf of Bristol to stir up an insurrection on behalf of Henry VI in Wales.[3] In England every one was sure that the long expected invasion by the French was about to take place. Sir Baldwin Fulford and Sir William Holland, Bastard of Exeter, had made their way to Devon and Cornwall some time before this and had been inciting the people to rebellion;[4] and just as it had been thought a few months earlier that the Beauforts had invited the French to land on the Isle of Wight, so now it was thought that Fulford and Holland were preparing for the coming of the French to Devon and Cornwall. Lords Audley, Fitzwarine, and Stourton were sent in haste to urge the southwestern counties to resist the French, and Geoffrey Gate and the Abbot of Quarre were again directed to call out the men of the Isle of Wight and the adjoining counties in case the French should attempt to land on the Isle. Some French ships having been espied off Yarmouth, Norfolk was called upon for men for the keeping of the sea, and other parts of England also helped to get a fleet together, while the men of Lydd, Sandwich, and Rye were kept busy hurrying back and forth with letters concerning "Frenchmen."[1] But again the French invasion failed to come to pass. Charles VII was so frightened by the battle of Towton and by the thought of what it was going to mean to have on the throne of England a strong young king who had evidently already succeeded in renewing the alliance between England and Burgundy, the alliance so disastrous to France in days gone by, that within a few weeks he actually began preparations to fight both Edward IV and Philip of Burgundy.[2] But an invasion of England was an undertaking beyond his power, and the attack on Jersey and Guernsey was Brezé's affair rather than Charles's.

---

[1] Basin, I, 307; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 34.

[2] Beaucourt, VI, 328; Chroniques de Jersey (Jersey, 1858), c. IV; Société Jersiaise, 1889, pp. 7, 72; Falle, Account of Jersey, 55, 293-294; Le Quesne, Constitutional Hist. of Jersey, 122.

[3] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 93. On 6th June Camuglio reported to Sforza that some London merchants had written that the French fleet had attacked the coast of Cornwall but, after doing some pillaging and burning, had returned towards Normandy, and twelve days later he said word had come from England that the French fleet had been repulsed with the loss of several thousand men. *Ibid.*, I, 95, 98. Yet in reality the French fleet never got as far as the Cornish coast.

[4] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 33.

If the fright caused by the events in Jersey and Guernsey was unduly great, all the alarming news from another quarter turned out to be only too true. Edward had scarcely reached Shene when word was received that Carlisle, "the key of the west marches," was besieged by the Scots. Margaret, with the Prince of Wales, the Duke of Exeter, Lord Rugemont-Grey, Sir Humphrey Dacre (now become, by his brother's death, Lord Dacre of Gillesland), Sir Edmund Hampden, Sir Robert Whitingham, Sir Henry Bellingham, and Sir Richard Tunstall, had led an army of Scots across the border to Carlisle, laid waste the country roundabout, burned the suburbs, and surrounded the city.[3] So grave was this news that Edward decided to return to the north as soon as possible and, for that reason, to hasten his coronation and postpone the parliament. Notice was given that parliament would not meet until 4th November, and 28th June was the date now set for the coronation.[4] But in a few days came the good news that Lord Montagu had raised the siege of Carlisle and killed six thousand Scots.

Montagu's victory removed all need for the king to hurry back to the north, but the Scots would come again when they could, and, in order to handicap them, an effort was made to rouse some of the restless spirits among James III's subjects. The means of doing this was at hand, as the Earl of Douglas and his brother, John Douglas of Balveny, were still in England and were more than ready to make themselves useful in such an enterprise. Together with Sir William Welles, John Kyngescote,[1] and John Stanley, the Douglases were commissioned to enter into communication with the Earl of Ross, commonly known as Lord of the Out Isles, who had once been Douglas's ally and who ruled almost independently north of Moray Firth, and with Ross's confederate, Donald Ballagh, a man who enjoyed considerable power not only in Scotland, but also in the north of Ireland.[2] It was believed that when these two men revolted Scotland would have her hands too full to give any more aid to Margaret of Anjou.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, I, 33, 34, 38; Paston Letters, III, 279, 283; Hist. MSS. Com., Report 5, app., p. 523.

[2] Beaucourt, VI, 338.

[3] Rolls of Parl., V, 478. See also Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 82, and Hist. MSS. Com., Report 9, app., 98-99.

[4] Reports touching Dignity of a Peer, IV, 953; Paston Letters, III, 280.

The date of the coronation was not changed again after the reassuring news came from Carlisle, although a week before the event there was talk that it would take place on Monday instead of on Sunday, because the preceding Holy Innocents' Day had fallen on a Sunday and made that day of the week an unlucky one for the rest of the year.[3] All sorts of preparations for the great occasion were now being made. Cooks and other helpers who would be needed in the royal kitchen, scullery, and saucery were being engaged; carpenters were being hired to make some necessary repairs, tables and other minor requisites were being made ready, and supplies of swans, peacocks, pheasants, and many other toothsome dainties were being laid in.[4] Four pounds were expended on a new sword for the king—probably the one of which he would make an offering as soon as the crown was placed on his head—and £6 13s. 4d. on the repairing of the royal barge. One thousand pounds in ready money was also assigned to George Darell, keeper of the Great Wardrobe, for expenses connected with the coronation which included, among other things, gifts to the Abbot of Westminster, to Master John Fenys, the king's cupbearer, to a godson of the king whose surname, unfortunately, the keeper's accounts do not record, and to others for gowns and vestments to be worn at the ceremony.[1] Everyone was eager to have a part in the festival, and petitions from those who could claim special privileges at the time of a coronation were pouring into the office of the steward of England, who was none other than the king's brother George.[2]

---

[1] Kyngescote became Bishop of Carlisle in the following year.
[2] Rymer, XI, 474; Tytler, Hist. of Scotland, IV, 125.
[3] Paston Letters, III, 280 and note. Cf. Mlle Dupont's edition of the Mémoires of Philippe de Commynes, I, 325, note.
[4] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 9, 13.

Edward made his state entry into London on Friday, 26th June.[3] The mayor and aldermen, in scarlet, and four hundred citizens, clad in green, conducted him from Lambeth Palace across the bridge to the Tower, and that evening he created twenty-eight knights of the Bath and in the morning four more. Among the men thus honoured were John Mowbray, son and heir of the Duke of Norfolk, Lord John Stafford, son of the dead Duke of Buckingham, the two chief justices, John Markham and Robert Danby, Walter Blount, and Lord Stanley's brother, William Stanley.[4] But the noblest youths who were knighted by the king were his brothers, and Garter and his fellow heralds and officers of arms received, in addition to ten pounds "for making of the new knights" at the Tower, a special gift of twenty marks "for the gift and largess of our dearest beloved brethren at the same place made knights."[5] When, on Saturday afternoon, the king rode in procession from the Tower to Westminster, the thirty-two new knights of the Bath, in their blue gowns with tokens of white silk lace on the left shoulder and hoods of white silk, "like to priests'," rode just in front of him.[6]

The coronation took place on Sunday morning in Westminster

---

[1] Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 21st June; Issue Roll, Easter 1 Edw. IV, 9th June and 2nd July; Enrolments of Wardrobe Accounts (Exchequer L. T. R.), roll 6, m. 53-54. When the king offered his sword, it was customary for the "worthiest earl" to buy it for a hundred shillings, and this money then belonged to the church in lieu of the sword. See "The maner and forme of the Kyngis and Quenes Coronacion in Englonde," Landsdowne MSS. 285, ff. 2-5 (written for Sir John Paston in the reign of Edward IV), and 260, ff. 60-66.

[2] London Letter Book L, f. 4; Report in Relation to the Appointment of Twelve Citizens of London to assist at the Coronation of Kings and Queens of England (London, 1831).

[3] Fabyan says Friday, 27th June, and Hearne's Fragment Thursday, 26th June. Both are wrong, as the 26th fell on Friday. Fabyan's slip is probably responsible for the statement of some of the later chroniclers that Edward's coronation took place on the 29th.

[4] Privy Seals; Kingsford's London Chron., 175-176; Fabyan, 640; Hearne's Fragment, 288; Shaw, The Knights of England.

[5] Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 10th July. Cf. Issue Roll, Easter 2 Edw. IV, 23rd May. Even in this warrant there seems to be a mistake in date, for the creation of the new knights is there stated to have taken place on Saturday "in the vigil of Saint Peter." As the feast of Peter and Paul was on 29th June, the vigil would be 28th June, which in this year fell on Sunday.

[6] Hearne's Fragment and Fabyan, *ut sup.* Cf. Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 112.

Abbey. The Archbishops of Canterbury and York anointed the king before the high altar and placed on his head the jewelled crown of Edward the Confessor—"the Rich Crown of King Edward," as it was called—which three days before Viscount Bourchier had taken from the "little coffin of leather bound with iron and locken with divers locks and keys" in which it was kept at the Treasury.[1] When this ceremony was over, the king, under a canopy of cloth of gold borne by the barons of the Cinque Ports, proceeded to Westminster Hall to partake of the sumptuous coronation banquet, at which the swans and the peacocks and the pheasants and many other unlucky birds and beasts were devoured.[2] Mayor Lee and a delegation of London citizens occupied, by an ancient right of their city, the first table on the left side of the hall, "next the cupboard," a most advantageous position, and after meat, when the tables had been removed and it was time for the king to take his "spices of wine," the mayor had the honour of offering the fragrant beverage "to the royal mouth" in a covered cup of gold, presenting at the same time a golden ewer filled with water "to temper the wine withal." At the end of the feast the mayor carried home the cup and the ewer as his fee and reward, just as the barons of the Cinque Ports were allowed, according to custom, to take away the canopy of cloth of gold which they had borne over the king.[3]

On Monday morning, St. Peter's Day, the king wore his crown again in Westminster Abbey, "in the worship of God and Saint Peter." Later in the day, at the Bishop of London's palace, he created his brother George Duke of Clarence. Garter and his fellows, who had just been allowed forty pounds for the coronation largess, in addition to what they had received at the making of the knights, were given another largess of ten pounds on this occasion, and twenty marks more "for the creation of our dearest beloved brother's estate."[1] The next day, which was the feast of the Commemoration of St. Paul, the king wore his crown a third time at St. Paul's, "in the worship of God and Saint Paul," and this time the ceremony must have been an unusually spectacular one, as an angel "came down and censed" the king, and the crowd of people at the cathedral was as great "as ever was seen afore in any days."[2]

---

[1] Palgrave, The Antient Kalendars and Inventories of the Treasury of His Majesty's Exchequer, II, 241; III, 1. The crown was not returned to the Treasury until 12th August, when it was put in a leather coffer with three locks, the keys of which the king retained. On 3rd March, 1462, Edward ordered the treasurer and chamberlains of the Exchequer to deliver "the Rich Crown of King Edward" to William Porte, keeper of the king's jewels, and the transfer was made ten days later. Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 3rd March; Palgrave, *ut sup.*

[2] Hearne's Fragment and Fabyan, *ut sup.;* Chron. of John Stone, 83; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 162; Archæologia, XXIX, 343. Cf. Lansdowne MSS. 285 and 260, *ut sup.*

[3] London Letter Book L, f. 4; Report in Relation to the Appointment of Twelve Citizens of London, etc., *ut sup.* This time the canopy of cloth of gold was divided between Dover and Romney, each taking one half of the cloth of gold, two of the four gilt lances which supported the canopy, and two of the silver-gilt bells which hung at the corners. Hist. MSS. Com., Report 5, app., 496, 544.

On the day on which he wore his crown at St. Paul's, the king created Viscount Bourchier Earl of Essex, and either at the same time or shortly after Lord Fauconberg was made Earl of Kent.[3] Still other friends of the king were ennobled, though by a different method. By writ of summons to parliament Sir John Wenlock became Lord Wenlock, Sir William Hastings Lord Hastings, Sir William Herbert Lord Herbert, Sir Robert Ogle Lord Ogle, Sir Humphrey Bourchier, third son of the new Earl of Essex, Lord Cromwell, Sir Thomas Lumley Lord Lumley, and Sir Humphrey Stafford Lord Stafford of Southwick. Finally, Sir Walter Devereux, whose wife was the daughter of the last Lord Ferrers of Chartley, was recognised as the successor to that title.[4]

Edward IV had distributed his coronation honours with a generous hand, but one friend who ought to have played a conspicuous part in all the coronation ceremonies and received a very special reward had been absent. Coppini, owing to no fault of his own, was still on the other side of the sea. He had been ready to cross to England at the beginning of June but, on the advice of Philip of Burgundy, had delayed his departure until he received instructions from the Pope. By 10th June he was at Antwerp, and there he fell in with Count Ludovico Dallugo and "the noble Zenon," two envoys whom the Duke of Milan had sent with letters of credence for him. Yet even now the expected instructions did not come from Rome, and there was some hitch or misunderstanding about Prospero Camuglio which tried the legate's temper a little. He was " upset " and did not know what to do, he wrote to Sforza, and he finally announced his intention of crossing to England, if there was a favourable opportunity, and doing what seemed best.[1] But either the favourable opportunity did not present itself or Coppini changed his mind, for, anxious as he must have been to assist at the coronation of the young king towards whose success he had contributed less than he thought, perhaps, but rather more than was seemly, three months more were to elapse before the legate saw England again.

---

[1] Kingsford's London Chron., 176; Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 10th July. Cf. Issue Roll, Easter 2 Edw. IV, 23rd May. An annuity of forty pounds in ready money was granted to Clarence and his heirs male the day after he was made a duke. Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 10th Nov.

[2] Kingsford's London Chron, *ut sup*. Cf. Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 174.

[3] Charter Roll 1 Edw. IV, part II, no. 192, m. 1; Dugdale, II, 129; Nicolas, Hist. Peerage, 271, note.

[4] Reports touching Dignity of a Peer, IV, 956.

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 92, 96.

CHAPTER III

GATHERING UP THE REINS OF GOVERNMENT

Before the world had had time to grow sober after the gaieties of the coronation, it was learned that Queen Margaret's friends had made another dash across the northern border. This time it was Lord Roos, Lord Rugemont-Grey, Sir Humphrey Dacre, Sir John Fortescue, Sir William Tailboys, titular Earl of Kyme, Sir Edmund Mountfort, and Thomas and Humphrey Neville of Brancepeth who, bringing King Henry with them, had stolen through Northumberland and across the Tyne to " rear war " in the northern counties. Two days before Edward's coronation these men had unfurled their banners at Ryton and at Brancepeth Castle, an ancient seat of the Nevilles about four miles southwest of Durham.[1]

Luckily Edward had in his service Nevilles more powerful than those of Brancepeth. Luckily, too, the Bishop of Durham, whose friendship he had taken such pains to secure, displayed all the zeal new converts usually show.[2] Henry's cause profited nothing by the bold raid across the Tyne, and at least one participator in it, Humphrey Neville, was soon after a prisoner in the Tower.[3] Nevertheless, it was evident that the northern border would have to be watched with the greatest care as long as Margaret was in Scotland, and Warwick was appointed general warden of the east and west marches and assigned five hundred marks for his expenses in guarding the northern counties.[4] The Earl of Douglas was also sent off on his embassy to the Earl of Ross and Donald Ballagh,[5] and Kyngescote and Stanley started for Ireland, where they evidently hoped to further the negotiations with Ballagh and whither they seem to have been accompanied by Sir William Welles, who was appointed chancellor of Ireland on 18th July and provided with a new "great patent seal" made and engraved by John Orwell of London.[1]

---

[1] Rolls of Parl., V, 478.

[2] The wardship and marriage of the son of Andrew Ogard, knight, was granted to Lawrence Booth in part recompense for the expenses borne by him in the diocese of Durham in resisting the " coming " of King Henry and his adherents. Warrants under the Signet, file 1377, 19th Dec., 1461. Cf. Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 12, 107.

[3] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 122.

[4] Rotuli Scotiæ, II, 402; Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 28th July; Issue Roll, Easter 1 Edw. IV, 7th August.

[5] On 8th July Edward directed that Douglas should be allowed a hundred marks for his expenses during this embassy; and as the earl afterwards

Danger threatened from the west as well as from the north in these days following the coronation. Pembroke and Harlech Castles and other strong places in Wales were still loyal to Henry VI, and the Earl of Pembroke, aided by the Duke of Exeter, who had joined him after the battle of Towton, was doing all he could to keep them so. While Warwick and Montagu guarded the north, therefore, Edward himself was getting ready for a campaign in Wales. On 8th July Lords Herbert and Ferrers of Chartley were empowered to array all the able-bodied men of Herefordshire, Gloucestershire, and Shropshire, and a few days later the master of the king's ordnance, Philip Harveys, was directed to have ready such necessaries of war as bombards, serpentines, saltpetre, bows, arrows, and bowstrings. A fleet was being fitted out, also, and on 12th July Henry Auger and Edmund Yns, who by this time had returned from northern waters, were commissioned to go to sea with a certain number of archers and men-at-arms.[2] By 20th July the king's "great ship" called the Margaret of Orwell, filled with bows and arrows, spears, lead malls, darts, gunpowder and gunstones, was lying in the Orwell ready to go to sea, and on the 27th orders were given for the delivery of more gunpowder, bows, arrows, and bowstrings to Yns for other of the king's ships. At the same time several of the southern counties were being importuned to furnish ships, as other parts of the realm, they were told, had already done, and early in August the *Grace Dieu* was

---

received a hundred and twenty pounds more for his expenses in going and coming, it would appear that he journeyed far. Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 8th July; Issue Roll, Mich. 1 Edw. IV, 25th Feb.

[1] Issue Roll, Easter 1 Edw. IV, 17th July; Chancery Miscellaneous Rolls, bundle 20, no. 12; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 21; Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 18th Sept.

[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 14, 36, 102. On 11th July the king assigned £1966 10*s.* to Warwick, who was still keeper of the sea, "for setting forth of our navy to the sea and keeping of the same," but with the understanding that the earl would repay the money out of the proceeds from tunnage and poundage already granted to him. This sum was paid into the hands of Yns. Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 11th July; Issue Roll, Easter 1 Edw. IV, 2nd July.

being manned and victualled at the Earl of Warwick's expense.[1]

The new fleet could not be made too powerful, as there might be need to use it against France as well as against Wales. Margaret's efforts to obtain help from Charles VII never ceased, and at no time had the realization of her hopes seemed so likely as at this moment. For though Charles would never go to war with Edward for Henry's sake alone, his fears were leading him to prepare to do so for his own when, in July, Margaret decided to send the Duke of Somerset, Lord Hungerford, who, it seems, had already made one fruitless journey to Charles's court,[2] and Sir Robert Whitingham to France. Somerset's mission was primarily to his friend, the Count of Charolais, and to the Dauphin Louis, but Hungerford and Whitingham were to go straight to Charles with a letter from Margaret in which she thanked the French king for the favour he had shown to her husband and herself "contre noz rebelles" and, with a promise that their captors should have due recompense, again asked him to hand over to her Vaughan and Malpas, with one Forster and other rebels.[3] Margaret's hope was that the Count of Charolais would not only give her help himself, but would influence the Dauphin to do the same; and from Charles VII she sought to obtain, through the influence of her uncle, the Count of Maine, Pierre de Brezé, and other lords of France to whom Hungerford carried letters, a treaty of peace, a loan of twenty thousand crowns, and an army which Somerset and Hungerford were empowered to conduct to Wales.[4]

But luck was on the side of the house of York. When Margaret's envoys reached Eu, they at once dispatched a messenger to Charles, but only to learn that the king was no more. The prediction of the astrologers which Coppini had reported to the Duke of Milan had come true and, in spite of prayers and processions for his health,[5] Charles had died at Mehun-sur-Yèvre on 22nd July, the very day on which Margaret had written her letter to him. Immediately Louis the Dauphin, whose banner had floated over the army of Edward IV at Towton, disbanded the troops his father had called out to make war on England,[1] and now he was about to start for Rheims for his coronation escorted by Philip of Burgundy, the Count of Charolais, Coppini, the Bishop of Salisbury, who had been at the Burgundian court since the first of May, and many other noble persons.[2]

---

[1] Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 20th and 27th July; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 37, 38.

[2] Déclaration de M. de Foix, Commynes-Lenglet, II, 310. Hungerford is here given his earlier title of Lord Molines.

[3] MS. français 20,855, f. 64. This letter from Margaret, which was written at Edinburgh on 22nd July, has been referred to briefly by Beaucourt, VI, 345, note. The Forster whom the queen wished to have surrendered along with Vaughan and Malpas was probably the John Forster who served as "provost" of Edward's army in France in 1475. See Scofield, Eng. Hist. Review, July, 1910, p. 548.

[4] Jean de Reilhac, secrétaire, etc., des rois Charles VII, Louis XI, et Charles VIII, I, 105-106. Cf. Milanese Papers, I, 101.

[5] Journal parisien de Jean Maupoint, 39; Mathieu d'Escouchy, III, 450.

The situation in which Somerset, Hungerford, and Whitingham found themselves was unpleasant, if not dangerous. News of their arrival was immediately sent to the Dauphin—or Louis XI, as he must now be called—and on 3rd August, while he was waiting for Philip to join him for the journey to Rheims, Louis hurried off Claude de Vaudenay, seneschal of Berry, and Jean de Reilhac to make sure that Margaret's envoys neither escaped nor did any harm. The Count of Charolais, alarmed for the safety of his friend Somerset, had already dispatched a messenger to Eu with warning letters, but Louis' men overtook the count's man at Abbeville, put spurs to their horses, and succeeded in reaching Eu a few hours ahead of him.

The first thing Vaudenay and Reilhac did at Eu was to take precautions to prevent the spiriting away of the papers Margaret's ambassadors had brought with them, and then they went to see Somerset and Hungerford. Somerset had to admit that he carried no safeconduct, but merely a surety from Margaret, and he declared that he had brought only one letter addressed to the Dauphin. That letter he readily surrendered, but Vaudenay and Reilhac took possession of the rest of his papers as well. Hungerford was provided with a safeconduct from Charles dated 27th March, but that made no difference. His papers also were seized. Then, while their servants were placed under guard and watch was kept at the gates of the town, the dismayed Englishmen were handed over to the care of the Count of Eu, or rather, as the count himself had gone to Rheims,[3] to the care of the count's wife. On the following day Somerset and six of his men were sent to Arques under armed escort and Hungerford and Whitingham, with the other members of the company, about forty persons in all, to

---

[1] Mandrot, Dépêches des ambassadeurs milanais en France, I, 8.

[2] Basin, IV, 226; Coulon, Fragment d'une chronique du règne de Louis XI (Rouen, 1895), 120-121; Reiffenberg, Hist. de l'Ordre de la Toison d'Or, 43.

[3] Coulon, Frag. d'une chronique, 119.

Dieppe, there to await the pleasure of the new king of France.[1]

From their separate places of durance Somerset and Hungerford tried to communicate with Margaret, but few if any of their letters reached the queen. One letter, written by Hungerford and Whittingham on 30th August, the Yorkists captured at sea.[2] It probably told little, however, that was not already known, as the only information which the queen's ambassadors sought to convey to her was that they had already sent her three letters, that her uncle, the king of France, was dead, that they and their companions had been arrested and their letters and papers taken to the new king, and that the Duke of Somerset was a prisoner at the castle of Arques, while they themselves, as they had a safeconduct, were allowed to stay in the town of Dieppe. They understood, they said, that they were to be called before the king on the following Tuesday, but while they tried to draw hope from that fact and bade the queen be "of good comfort," they also urged her to "beware that ye adventure not your person, nor my Lord the Prince, by the sea till ye have other word from us, unless that your person cannot be sure there as ye are and that extreme necessity drive you thence; and for God's sake the king's Highness be advised the same. For, as we be informed, the Earl of March is into Wales by land and hath sent his navy thither by sea."[3]

To the Yorkists the death of Charles VII was as much of a blessing as it was a blow to Margaret's hopes. Now that Charles was removed, the throne of Edward IV, which, even after the battle of Towton, had looked not very steady to eyes across the sea,[4] seemed practically secure, and straightway Philip of Burgundy showed signs of a desire to enter into an open alliance with Edward, and Scotland a willingness to negotiate a truce. Immediately after Charles's death Philip sent one Philip Lowyn, captain or lieutenant of Boulogne, to England with messages which won for their bearer a reward of forty pounds,[5] and on 8th August Edward

[1] Jean de Reilhac, I, 102-107. See also Chastellain, IV, 65-66; Waurin, II, 314, note; Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 101; and the Déclaration de M. de Foix, Commynes-Lenglet, II, 310.

[2] The accounts of the town of Lydd contain a record of the payment of 26*s*. 8*d*. for "leading up the man to the king that was take with letters from the Duke of Somerset." Hist. MSS. Com., Report 5, app., 523.

[3] Paston Letters, III, 306-307.

[4] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 94, 99.

[5] Issue Roll, Easter 1 Edw. IV, 7th August; Chancery Miscellaneous Rolls, bundle 20, no. 12. Lowyn was also given six pounds for his passage home. Issue Roll, Mich. 1 Edw. IV, 7th Dec.

named Lord Wenlock, Sir John Clay, victualler of Calais and great steward to the Duchess of York, and Peter Taster, Dean of St. Severin's, to negotiate with the duke regarding a treaty of mercantile intercourse, a truce, and other matters.[1] Six days earlier Warwick had been empowered to treat with the king of Scots for a truce.[2]

Another result which seemed likely to follow from the death of Charles VII was a complete change in the policy of Edward and Warwick towards France. The king and the earl had listened with willing ears to Coppini's urgings that they should attack France as soon as England was won, but now that Louis, who had been their friend and the friend of their friend, Philip of Burgundy, had ascended the French throne, the whole situation was so altered that it looked as if the league against France would fall to pieces. Wenlock, Clay, and Taster were even directed to seek Philip in France, and in all probability they carried instructions to treat with Louis as well. But it was easy to foresee that Louis the king would be a different person from Louis the Dauphin, and Edward did not place any great amount of confidence in the friendship of his new neighbour. He felt the more need of circumspection, too, because at this very moment some envoys from the Duke of Milan were at his court.

Sforza wrote a letter of congratulation to Edward as soon as he heard of the battle of Towton and sent it to England in the care of Antonio della Torre, who also carried letters from the duke to Warwick, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the chancellor and treasurer of England, Lord Berners, and Lord Fauconberg. At the same time the duke wrote to Coppini that he was instructing Prospero Camuglio to accompany him to England. Nevertheless, both the legate and Messer Prospero lingered in France and accompanied Louis XI to Rheims, where Coppini had the bad taste to pronounce an absolution over the tomb of Charles VII, as if Charles had died under the ban of the Church, and by so doing laid up more trouble for himself. Only Count Ludovico Dallugo, Giovanni Pietro Cagnola of Lodi, and perhaps "the noble Zenon" who had been with Dallugo when Coppini ran across him at Antwerp in June, crossed to England to pay Sforza's respects to the new king.[3]

It was about the end of the first week of July that Dallugo and his companions reached England, and as Edward feasted them so bounteously that the count was promptly laid up with the gout, they had to stay longer than they had intended to do. On 28th July Camuglio, probably basing his statement on letters received from Dallugo, wrote to Cicco Simonetta from Bruges that Edward and Warwick had given their oath to the English people to follow up the enterprise which the Dauphin and the Duke of Burgundy had urged them to undertake, and that they would cross to France as soon as Edward's throne was secure.[1] He added, however, what really went without saying, that the Dauphin, now that he was king, wanted to keep his kingdom intact, without any such partners as Edward and Warwick; and a letter which Cagnola wrote from London three days later sounds very much as if the labours of Sforza's ambassadors in England had dwindled to a search for dogs and horses. "The king yesterday rode to a castle of his called Windsor for hunting," wrote Cagnola; "we shall go there tomorrow. The king's desires seem to me to be directed towards having some sort of pleasure. . . . I believe that at this hunt we ought to be able to find the dogs, from what I have heard, and otherwise it will not be possible to have them. I have tried to buy some, but have not found any, the reason being that those who have good dogs are lords and one cannot buy from them. . . . From Calais the count has brought nine hackneys, all dappled but not too big." "Everyone here," added the writer, "rejoices at the death of the king of France."[2]

---

[1] French Roll 1 Edw. IV, m. 21.

[2] Rymer, XI, 475.

[3] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 96-97, 100-101; Basin, II, 13.

A month later the Milanese ambassadors had at last departed, and then Dallugo himself wrote that he had been received with such honour in England that all the Venetian, Genoese, and Florentine merchants who came to see him while he was there assured him that never before had so much honour been paid to any embassy. King Edward "loves you as if you were his father," he told Sforza, and whenever he proposed to leave, he said, the king made some pleasant reply and took him to one of his castles and chases. When at last he was permitted to depart, the king accompanied him in person to Sandwich, and Dallugo declared that the inhabitants of the towns through which they passed loved Edward so that they adored him like a god. "The lords adherent to King Henry," he went on to say, "are all quitting him and come to tender obedience to this king, and at this present one of the chief of them has come, by name Lord de Rivers, with one of his sons, men of very great valour.[1] I held several conversations with this Lord Rivers about King Henry's cause and what he thought of it, and he answered me that the cause was lost irretrievably." "I have purchased nine very handsome hackneys," he did not fail to add, "all white, though rather young. We could not get any others by reason of these wars, and what with our rough passage across and the embarcation and disembarcation, they were a little frightened, so that I have brought them here to Bruges and will let them rest awhile."[2]

---

[1] Mandrot, Dépêches des ambassadeurs milanais, I, 16-17.
[2] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 100.

It was a bright picture which Dallugo drew of the situation in Edward's kingdom. Yet the anxieties of the young king and of Warwick, who, Cagnola had written, "seems to me to be everything in this kingdom," were still numerous and serious. For Henry VI's cause, Lord Rivers's opinion notwithstanding, was not entirely hopeless even now. Aside from the fact that it was not yet certain that there was going to be a favourable change in the attitude of France and Scotland towards the house of York, the seeds of rebellion and disorder scattered broadcast over England during years of civil war were bearing an abundant harvest in the form of local insurrections and general lawlessness which kept the kingdom in a state of turmoil and fed the hopes of the Lancastrians. Murder and robbery were so common that one of John Paston's correspondents remarked that the world was "right wild," and his wife begged him to "beware how ye ride and go, for naughty and evil disposed fellowships."[3] Edward gave notice of his intention to punish all malefactors severely and impartially by ordering the hand of one of his own servants, John Davy, to be cut off at the Standard in Cheapside because he had struck a man in the presence of the judges in Westminster Hall.[4]

---

[1] Cagnola had stated in his letter of 31st July, quite incorrectly apparently, that Warwick had captured Rivers and his son and sent them to the king, who had imprisoned them in the Tower. Equally incorrect, it would seem, was a report he heard that the Duke of Exeter had signified his wish to return and ask for pardon.

[2] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 101-102; Cal. Venetian Papers, I, 111-112.

[3] Paston Letters, III, 286, 288.

[4] Kingsford's London Chron., 176; Fabyan, 640. Some consolation seems to have been administered to Davy a few months later by a grant of the custody of one of the royal manors. Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 52. In 1475 a man of the same name was condemned in London to the pillory and imprisonment for fabricating a powder called "saunclers." London Letter Book L, f. 111.

But the warning had little effect. In Somerset and Dorset there were riots and other disorders; in Sussex, Northamptonshire, and Gloucestershire there was a similar state of things; Cornwall and Devon were still in the throes of the insurrection which Sir Baldwin Fulford and the Bastard of Exeter had stirred up; and in August it was necessary to inquire into the crimes committed in Norfolk, friendly as that county was to the house of York.[1]

Edward was also confronted with the old difficulty, lack of money. For much as the battle of Towton had accomplished, it had not filled the Exchequer. On 15th July the convocation of Canterbury granted a tenth,[2] but this was far from enough to pay the king's bills. It was inevitable that Edward's expenses should be heavy in the first months of his reign, as the kingdom had to be set to rights and friends old and new had to be rewarded, but the household accounts show that no attempt was being made to economize. During Edward's absence in the north, the priests and clerks of the chapel and the other servants of the household were maintained at Baynard's Castle for the service of the Duchess of York, and although during that time seventeen hundred pounds were paid in for the expenses of the household, before the king's return all that amount and more had been paid out again, partly in gifts and rewards to many persons and for wine furnished to the duchess.[3] And the expenditures at Baynard's Castle were a mere fraction of the household bills. Sir John Fogge received £416 13*s.* 4*d.* for the household expenses during Edward's first stay in York, £146 13*s.* 4*d.* during the king's second stay there, and £362 3*s.* 4*d.* during the days spent at Durham. From 4th March to 30th September the household expenses amounted, all told, to £10,105 17*s.* 11d. q^a.[4]

---

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 33, 37, 66, 102, 134-135. Cf. Basin's description of the condition of England at this time. I, 302.

[2] Wilkins, Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ, III, 580; Wake, State of the Church, 373; Fine Roll 1 Edw. IV, m. 23.

[3] Household Accounts, Accounts, etc. (Exchequer K. R.), bundle 411, nos. 11 and 12. Four London brewers who provided more than thirty pounds' worth of ale for the chapel while it was at Baynard's Castle had to wait two years for their pay, and one Philip Nele who furnished three hundred and eighty-nine muttons for the household during April, May, and June was kept waiting even longer for his money. Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 8th Jan. and 3 Edw. IV, 17th March.

[4] Household Accounts, *ut sup.* 100 marks of the household money was spent to replace horses lost by certain of the king's servants in the battle of Towton. Richard Langport, clerk of the council, lost 20 marks in money and a book valued at 5 marks on the battlefield, and he received 25 marks at the Exchequer to make good his loss. He also received £10 10*s.* for his

As the king's expenses were so heavy and his income so depleted, he had to go on doing what he had been doing from the first. He had to ask for loans. The long-suffering mayor and aldermen of London had let him have an additional two thousand marks on 7th April, making a total of eleven thousand pounds which they had advanced to the Yorkists since Edward and Warwick returned from Calais, and yet Fogge managed to get over six hundred and fifty pounds more from them on 14th July.[1] The king was not ungrateful, for he rewarded London's generosity by granting the citizens the office of gauger of wines and the right of package and scavage; but in the meantime the treasure chests at the Guildhall must have been almost as empty as those at Westminster. The king also obtained three hundred pounds from John Lambard, one of the sheriffs of London, five hundred marks from the great Bristol merchant, William Canynges, and a thousand pounds from the merchants of the staple, who received in return a temporary grant of 6*s.* 8*d.* out of the subsidy of each sack of wool and each two hundred and forty woolfells shipped by them from England.[2] Nor was that all. Begging letters were sent out in all directions to abbots and abbesses, priors and prioresses, as well as to many laymen, and a sort of special bureau was set up at Westminster during the summer vacation to receive both the expected loans and the receipts from the tenth granted by convocation.[3] During the first months of Edward's reign more than forty houses of religion sent in loans ranging in amount from eight pounds to a hundred pounds. Oriel College, Oxford, also loaned the king a hundred marks, while William Westbury, provost of the college Henry VI had founded at Eton, sent a loan of four hundred marks and then discreetly turned it into a gift. The bishops also did their share, the Bishop of Lincoln coming forward with a loan of three hundred pounds and the Bishops of London, Rochester, Chichester, Bath, Worcester, and Hereford with smaller sums.[4]

---

services while attending upon the king in the north and 40*s.* for parchment, paper, wax, and ink that he had bought. Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 27th July; Issue Roll, Easter 1 Edw. IV, 9th June.

[1] Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 24th July; Household Accounts, *ut sup.*, no. 11.

[2] Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 26th July; Receipt Roll, Easter 1 Edw. IV, 17th and 23rd July; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 44, 54.

[3] Issue Roll, Easter 1 Edw. IV, 23rd July and 26th Sept. One of these entries is of a payment to John Warde and other servants of the king's chamber sent with letters under the signet to divers abbots and other persons. The Receipt Rolls leave no doubt as to the purport of the letters.

[4] Receipt Roll, Easter 1 Edw. IV; Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 20th July.

Still another source from which Edward obtained money in these first months of his reign was the foreign merchants living in London. The Venetian merchants, who had been so harshly treated by the ministers of Henry VI because the Flanders galleys refused to serve against the Yorkists, loaned Edward a hundred pounds and later two hundred marks more, the Genoese merchants loaned him a hundred pounds, and two Florentine merchants, Simon Nori and Leonardo Bonezyn, loaned him three hundred pounds between them; while Edward showed his appreciation of all this by granting general letters of protection and safeconduct to the Genoese merchants in July, to the Florentine merchants in October, and to the Venetian merchants in December. The Genoese also secured the confirmation of a four years' treaty between their city and the English which had been signed in the preceding year.[1]

But from the most powerful company of foreign merchants in London, the Easterlings or German Hansards, Edward asked no favours. To their amazement and dismay the Hansards found that the privileges which they had enjoyed in England during the reign of Henry VI, and during many preceding reigns, were regarded as cancelled by the overthrow of the house of Lancaster and that, in consequence, they were at the mercy of the new king.[2] To make matters worse for them, the Londoners, who looked with jealous dislike on all foreigners, felt a special antipathy for them because, while the Hansards enjoyed greater privileges in London than any other foreigners and paid lower customs duties and in other ways were more favoured than even the native merchants themselves,[3] the Hanse towns were unwilling to grant to Englishmen privileges corresponding to those which England had for so many years granted to their citizens. It happened, therefore, that when the Hansards requested Edward to confirm their privileges, the Londoners made so "grote clachte" that all the king dared to do was to grant them a continuance of their privileges until Candlemas Day, 1462.[1] Both the king of Poland and the Emperor Frederick III interceded for the distressed merchants, but the only concession which requests, gifts, and promises could obtain for them —and that concession was made in direct opposition to the wishes of the House of Commons, before which the Londoners laid their complaints—was a further continuance of their privileges until Christmas, 1462.[2]

---

[1] Receipt Roll, Easter 1 Edw. IV, 22nd June, 17th July, 26th Sept.; Writs of Privy Seal, file 784, no. 265, file 786, no. 452, file 788, no. 629; French Roll 1 Edw. IV, m. 29 and 37; Rymer, XI, 441; Palgrave, Kalendars of the Exchequer, II, 239-240. On 5th September Edward empowered the chancellor to make out letters patent, according to a form which he enclosed, to all strangers "having any household or keeping any castle" in England who desired to have such letters, and to receive from them their oath of allegiance. Signed Bills, file 1487, 5th Sept., 1461.

[2] Hanserecesse, II, 5, pp. 60-61.

[3] They paid 3*d*. on general merchandise, while other foreigners, and native merchants also, paid 12*d*. *Ibid*., p. 179; Hansisches Urkundenbuch, X, 146-147.

On 12th or 13th August Edward started out with the Earl of Essex and a small number of attendants to visit the counties of the south and west and then meet the army which Herbert and Ferrers of Chartley had been raising for the reduction of the Welsh castles.[3] By this time more commissions to raise men in the western counties had been issued, arrangements had been made to take the muster of the army at Hereford on 8th September and, in anticipation of victory, Herbert and Ferrers of Chartley had been empowered to receive into the king's peace all submissive rebels in Wales except all lords, Sir John Skydmore, who was holding Pembroke Castle, Thomas Cornwall, constable of Radnor Castle, and Thomas Fitzharry.[4] But Edward was looking for a campaign of some length, and about the time he left Windsor his tents were sent to Hereford in charge of Richard Garnet, sergeant of the tents, and Philip Harveys started off with the ordnance he had been getting ready. Two thousand marks in ready money were also scraped together and dispatched to Hereford in eight pairs of " bowges " for the king's use there.[5]

Some persons had thought that Edward would pay a visit to Norfolk,[6] but instead he proceeded at once to Canterbury. There he was received by Archbishop Bourchier and the monks of Christ Church at the cathedral entrance and the city had prepared for his coming in so extravagant a manner that three of the wealthier citizens had to be called on for loans which were not repaid for several years. Perhaps because the cheer was so good, the king stayed three days at Canterbury; and the first day he was present at evensong in the cathedral and the following one he walked in the procession both at high mass and at the second evensong. On the 17th he departed for Sandwich, and it was at Sandwich that Dallugo, the Milanese envoy, took his leave with the conviction, gained from what he had seen along the way as he journeyed from London with the king, that Edward was adored like a god by his new subjects.[1]

---

[1] Hanserecesse, II, 5, pp. 85-88. The Hansards afterwards stated that the Londoners were " the letters that the king confirmed not their privileges " at the beginning of his reign. Hansisches Urkundenbuch, X, 150.

[2] Hanserecesse, II, 5, pp. 97, 102, 123, 181, 185; Hansisches Urkundenbuch, VIII, 647, 659, 664, 667; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 109.

[3] Privy Seals; Paston Letters, III, 299, 302. The Earl of Essex received £100 for attending upon the king during his progress. Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 23rd Sept.

[4] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 38, 45, 65, 98-99. Cornwall had been constable of Radnor Castle since March, 1460. Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 576.

[5] Issue Roll, Easter 1 Edw. IV, 9th June, 23rd July; Chancery Miscellaneous Rolls, bundle 20, no. 12. The entry in the Issue Roll concerning the money sent to the king at Hereford stands under the date of 9th June, and yet Edward's first visit to Hereford after his accession was made in September.

[6] Paston Letters, III, 298, 299.

After a short stay at Sandwich, Edward visited Ashford, Battle, Lewes, and Arundel. By the 27th, however, he was at Bishop's Waltham, where he found the Bishop of Winchester engaged in a controversy with the tenants of his manor of East Meon which had grown so serious that, about three weeks before, the bishop had asked for a commission of *oyer* and *terminer* to settle the matter.[2] When the king arrived, the tenants, who probably thought that he would be inclined to side with them, as Wayneflete had been Henry VI's chancellor, came to him and asserted that the bishop and his officers had forced them to make payments and do services for their holdings which ought not to have been required of them. But Edward, who had no wish to antagonize Wayneflete and no sympathy, now that he was king, with anything savouring of rebellion against authority, replied that he did not have time to look into the matter properly. He ordered the tenants to submit to the bishop's demands until parliament met and then send up to Westminster two or three men from each lordship with full instructions and proofs of their claims. The tenants were promised that parliament would listen to them and give them an answer "according to reason," but as some of the ringleaders among them were sent to prison in the meantime, the future did not look very favourable to their hopes.[3]

From Bishop's Waltham Edward went to Salisbury, where he was welcomed by all the citizens arrayed in dark green gowns and black felts and was presented with a cup of gold and twenty pounds in money; and from Salisbury he rode by way of Devizes to Bristol, where he arrived on 4th September.[1] Bristol had made such elaborate preparations for his reception that the contemporary historian of the town claims King Edward was there "full honourably received in as worshipful wise as ever he was in any town or city"—a boast evidently quite justified, for when the king reached the Temple Gate, a great giant delivered the keys of the town to him after William the Conqueror, attended by three lords, had addressed him with these words:

---

[1] Privy Seals; Chron. of John Stone, 84; Hist. MSS. Com., Report 9, app., 140; Cal. Venetian Papers, I, 112. Canterbury had just secured a royal charter confirming the city's franchises and privileges for which she paid £10 at the Hanaper. Fine Roll 1 Edw. IV, m. 4; Charter Roll I Edw. IV, part 1, no. 191.

[2] Privy Seals; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 38.

[3] Rolls of Parl., V, 475-476; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 174; Chandler, Life of Wayneflete, 111, 348-349.

> "Well come, Edwarde, our son of high degre,
> Many yeeris hast thou lakkyd owte of this londe.
> I am thy fore fader, Wylliam of Normandye,
> To see thy welefare here through Goddys sond."

Another spectacle which had been prepared at the Temple Cross must have been even more picturesque than the one at the gate, as there the king beheld Saint George on horseback "upon a tent, fighting with a dragon, and the king and the queen on high in a castle, and his daughter beneath with a lamb. And at the slaying of the dragon there was a great melody of angels."[2]

During his stay in Bristol Edward was the guest of William Canynges, who was then serving as mayor of the town for the fourth time. In Mayor Canynges's house, which stood in Redcliffe Street, not far from the church of St. Mary Redcliffe, there were many luxuries, such as tiled floors and windows filled with glass,[3] that were far from common in English homes, and Edward found himself so comfortable that he lingered on for nearly, if not quite, a week. During that time he so ingratiated himself with his host that Canynges added to the loan of five hundred marks which he had already made to him a contribution of fifty marks towards the expenses of his household. Nor was a week of luxurious living and a gift of fifty marks all that the king got out of his visit to Bristol. He succeeded in drawing at least three Bristol ships, the *Christopher Damme*, the *Christopher Howell*, and the *Julian*, into his service, and they seem to have been sent to Milford with supplies for those who were conducting the siege of Pembroke Castle. But of course Canynges and his fellow townsmen expected some reward for all that they had done for the pleasure of their guest, and what Edward granted them was the exemption of the town, suburbs, and county of Bristol from the jurisdiction of the king's admirals and from answering pleas in the court of admiralty.[1]

---

[1] Privy Seals; Hatcher, Old and New Sarum, 156; Hist. MSS. Com., Various Coll., IV, 204.

[2] Ricart's Kalendar, 43; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 85-86; Warkworth, 32.

[3] Pryce, Memorials of the Canynges Family and their Times (1854), 114-125; Cunningham, Growth of English Industry and Commerce, Early and Middle Ages, 345-346.

It is sad to have to record that the king's stay in Bristol closed with a tragic scene. One John Staplehill had recently captured Sir Baldwin Fulford when that gentleman was on his way to Brittany, it was said, to raise men for Henry VI; and while Edward was at Bristol, the prisoner was brought in to his presence, tried before a commission headed by the Earl of Essex and Lord Hastings, and sentenced to death. On 9th September the bold knight of Devonshire who had once vowed "on pain of losing of his head" to destroy the Earl of Warwick and his fleet, with one of his confederates, named John Heysaunt, was hanged, drawn, beheaded, and quartered. Fulford's head was sent to Exeter to be hung up in the market place, and there it remained until March, 1463, when Sir Thomas Fulford petitioned the king for permission to bury it.[2] As for Staplehill, he asked for a grant of some of his prisoner's lands and tenements valued at twenty pounds a year and obtained it; but a year later he sent a new petition to the king in which he stated that, as he had had "none very knowledge" of Fulford's belongings at the time he drew up his first petition, he put in his bill "such livelihood whereof the said Baldwin was never possessed" and in consequence had profited nothing by the grant made to him. A new grant amounting to forty marks yearly was then offered to him out of Sir Baldwin's estates, and with this he seems to have been satisfied for a time; but two years later, after he had put the king in his debt again by serving under the Earl of Northumberland at the battle of Hexham, he presented a third petition. This time he declared that the letters patent of the grant last made to him had not been drawn up in the proper form and asked for new ones, and as Edward was again obliging, fresh letters patent were drawn up and sealed on 9th August, 1464.[1] But not long after troubles of another kind overtook the petitioner. For Sir Thomas Fulford had never forgotten who it was that had handed his father over to the executioners and had also robbed him of a part of his father's estates, and one day a fourth petition from Staplehill was received at the Chancery. In this petition Staplehill reported that on the preceding 17th April, when he was away from home, "one Thomas Fulford, knight, with other riotous persons aggregate unto him, to the number of two thousand persons, arrayed in manner of war, that is to say, in cuirass, briganders, jacks, salets, with bows and arrows and other weapons and habiliments of war, both invasive and defensive, came to the house of your said beseecher at Fulford in the county of Devonshire and there the said house brake and entered, and out of the same house all the goods moveable of your said suppliant, to the value of three hundred pounds, feloniously and riotously, in manner of insurrection, took away, and there the servants of your said beseecher sore beat and grievously wounded and bound them fast, both foot and hand, and, over that, the wife of your said beseecher so menaced, affrayed, and disturbed that she was, and yet is, in despair of her life, and said that if your said beseecher had there then been founden, there should no gold have redeemed him."[2] But perhaps the king was tired of Staplehill, or perhaps he thought that in Fulford's place he would have done likewise, for no attempt seems to have been made to punish Sir Thomas for wreaking vengeance on his father's captor.[3]

---

[1] Household Accounts, *ut sup.*, nos. 11 and 12; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 85, 99-100. Worcester's Itinerarium contains a memorandum regarding the ships built by Canynges at Bristol at the end of which appears this note: "Item ultra ista Edwardus rex quartus habuit de dicto Wilelmo III milia marcarum pro pace sua habenda." These three thousand marks may have been a fine demanded of Canynges because of his former attachment to the house of Lancaster or the sum contributed by the merchants of the town through the mayor to the king (Cf. Dallaway, Antiquities of Bristow, 187, and Pryce, 128-129), but more likely it was what the town paid to secure the confirmation of its charters and the grant mentioned above.

[2] Ellis, Original Letters, Series I, Vol. I, 16; Ricart's Kalendar, *ut sup.*; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 77 (Fulford's execution is placed too early here); Rolls of Parl., VI, 231; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 92 (3rd June, 1468); Exchequer T. R., Council and Privy Seal, file 89, m. 28; Inquisitions *post mortem*, 1 Edw. IV, no. 31. It is Fulford's death which Chatterton immortalized in his "Bristowe Tragedie," but he changed the name to Sir Charles Bawdin.

Immediately after the execution of Sir Baldwin Fulford, Edward left Bristol for Gloucester. It was dangerous ground on which he was treading now, but as Herbert and Ferrers of Chartley had been sent ahead to "cleanse the country," he reached Gloucester without accident on 11th September.[4] It was not until the 17th, however, that he arrived at Hereford, and as this was nine days after the date set for the muster of the army, and as he went on at once to Ludlow, the muster must have taken place before his arrival or else been abandoned. Yet the campaign in Wales had not been given up, although the death of Charles VII and the consequent check put on Margaret of Anjou's schemes may have led Edward to feel that it was unnecessary for him to take part in it personally. He stayed at Ludlow from the 18th to the 26th, and then, leaving the work in Wales to Herbert and Ferrers, he went slowly back towards London, stopping again at Stony Stratford, where he may have caught another glimpse of Elizabeth Woodville. A few days after he reached London he went down to Greenwich to wait for the assembling of parliament and probably to enjoy a little hawking, as 106*s.* 8*d.* was spent about this time for a couple of falcons for him.[1]

---

[1] Signed Bills, file 1491, 18th Sept., 1462; file 1495, 9th August, 1464; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 54, 227, 359.

[2] Early Chancery Proceedings, bundle 31, no. 37.

[3] Fulford was granted a pardon on 28th January, 1465. Pardon Roll 1-6 Edw. IV, m. 7. But his attack on Staplehill was probably made after that date, as Staplehill's other petitions make no reference to it.

[4] Ellis, Original Letters, *ut sup.;* Privy Seals.

After the king went back to London, Herbert and Ferrers exerted themselves to the utmost, and with so much success that on 30th September Sir John Skydmore surrendered Pembroke Castle and allowed Herbert to administer the oath of allegiance to him. But Skydmore had demanded, before he surrendered, a promise of pardon with "life, livelihood, and goods," and in order to make such a promise Herbert had to go back to the commission which had empowered him and Ferrers to receive the submission of repentant rebels with the exception of Skydmore and some others and find his authority in certain letters of privy seal of an earlier date giving him power to admit to grace and pardon all such persons in Wales as he considered acceptable.[2]

The capture of Pembroke Castle was a matter of even greater importance than was realized at the moment, because with it Herbert captured a four year old boy who had spent all his life in it. This boy was Henry Tudor, the son of Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond, great-granddaughter of John of Gaunt, and of her first husband, Edmund Tudor, half-brother of Henry VI and son of the Owen Tudor whom Edward had beheaded after his victory at Mortimer's Cross. Henry Tudor would be the next English representative of the blood of John of Gaunt if Henry VI and his son should die without direct heirs, but as such an extinction of the house of Lancaster was not likely to occur and as Margaret Beaufort's present husband, Sir Henry Stafford, though he had fought for Henry VI at Towton, had already repented and received a general pardon,[1] Edward seems to have given little thought either to the small boy in Pembroke Castle or to the boy's pious and cultured mother. When Pembroke Castle was granted to Lord Herbert four months after he captured it, he was also given, on payment of a thousand pounds, the custody and marriage of Henry Tudor.[2] Henry's patrimony, the county, honour, and lordship of Richmond, was taken from him and given first to Edward's brother Richard and then to his brother George, but Sir Henry Stafford secured another general pardon, this time including his wife, on the day that the custody of his stepson was granted to Herbert, and on two occasions when an act of resumption took away many a piece of property from many a faithful subject of Edward IV, care was taken to reserve to the Countess of Richmond all that she held by right of inheritance from her father and by right of dower from her first husband.[3] In the meantime Henry Tudor was growing up under the eye of Lady Herbert, and although in after days he complained to Philip de Commynes that, from the time he was five years old, he had been either a fugitive or a prisoner, in reality he was carefully reared and educated by Lady Herbert, and a will made by Lord Herbert shows that he hoped the landless young earl living in his household would become the husband of his daughter.[4]

---

[1] Privy Seals; Paston Letters, III, 314; Issue Roll, Easter 1 Edw. IV, 25th Sept. Edward had two falconers and ten grooms or pages in his household at this time. One Thomas Hardegros, evidently a foreigner, was the groom of the otterhounds. Enrolments of Wardrobe Accounts (Exchequer L. T. R.), roll 6, m. 53-54.

[2] Rolls of Parl., VI, 29-30. A copy of the pardon Herbert gave to Skydmore may be found in Chancery Diplomatic Documents (Domestic), no. 945.

After the fall of Pembroke Castle the other Welsh castles which had been holding out for King Henry surrendered one by one, until only Harlech Castle remained unconquered. As early as 4th October John Paston was assured in a letter from London that all the castles and strongholds in Wales had yielded to King Edward, that the Duke of Exeter and the Earl of Pembroke had fled to the mountains pursued by "divers lords with great puissance," and that "the most part of gentlemen and men of worship are come in to the king, and have grace, of all Wales." On 16th October Exeter and Pembroke and Thomas Fitzharry "reared war" again near Cærnarvon, but they could not recover what had been lost.[1]

---

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 12. Stafford did not die in the year 1481, as has been generally supposed (see Dugdale, I, 167), but on 4th October, 1471. Inquisitions *post mortem*, 11 Edw. IV, no. 6.

[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 114.

[3] *Ibid.*, I, 197, 212; Rolls of Parl., V, 471, 523, 550; VI, 227-228; Pardon Roll 1-6 Edw. IV, m. 41.

[4] Commynes, I, 456-457; Vergil, Historiæ Anglicæ Libri XXVII, 662; Dugdale, II, 258.

While Herbert and Ferrers were accomplishing so much for Edward in Wales, other lieutenants of the king were making gains in other places. In the north the three Nevilles, Warwick, Montagu, and Fauconberg, were still on guard, and although neither chronicles nor records supply much information about their activities after the raising of the siege of Carlisle, it is evident that they were gradually pushing nearer the Scottish border. Probably because changes were taking place almost daily, it is not easy to determine just how much of the north was still loyal to Henry at this time and just how much had submitted to Edward. But the Yorkists must have advanced as far north as Alnwick before the middle of September, as three months later Edward ordered that one hundred pounds out of the issues and profits of the lordship of Alnwick should be paid to Sir William Bowes, because by his commandment Bowes had assumed the government and keeping of the castle of Alnwick on 13th September and had continued to hold it since that time with a hundred men.[2] By Michaelmas, too, Sir Ralph Percy had submitted and was holding Dunstanborough for Edward.[3] But Northumberland was in a sorry state, and Sir George Lumley, who, in addition to his command at Tynemouth,[4] held the office of sheriff of Northumberland from November, 1461, to November, 1463, was ultimately excused from paying all fines, issues, reliefs, etc., due from him by reason of his office, in part because the devastation wrought by the king's rebels and traitors had been so great that he could not collect them and in part because he had resisted the said rebels and traitors at great expense to himself.[5]

[1] Paston Letters, III, 312; Rolls of Parl., V, 478.

[2] Writs of Privy Seal, file 788, 2nd Dec. Cf. Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 79.

[3] Cadwallader Bates, Border Holds of Northumberland, 178, 430.

[4] In September the garrison at Tynemouth was reduced from forty to twenty-four men, and with this small force Lumley held the place until 11th January, 1462. In the meantime his father, Lord Lumley, was put in charge of Newcastle by Lord Fauconberg and remained in command there, with a garrison of one hundred and twenty men, from Michaelmas until 13th January. Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 13th Jan. and 4 Edw. IV, 4th June; Issue Roll, Mich. 1 Edw. IV, 30th Jan.

[5] Warrants under the Signet, file 1377, 4th June, 1464. Cf. Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 332.

Another gain made for Edward during the autumn months of 1461 was in his small territory over-sea. As early as April Lord Duras, marshal of Calais, and Richard Whetehill, lieutenant of Guines, had been sent to lay siege to Hammes Castle,[1] but the king of France immediately appeared in the neighbourhood with some fifteen hundred horse and Duras and Whetehill had to retire.[2] The siege of Hammes was only temporarily abandoned, however, and in July, when the fall of the castle was probably thought to be imminent, authority was given to Duras, Whetehill, Louis Galet, and others to make terms for its surrender.[3] Whatever negotiations took place at that time must have come to naught, as it was stated in a letter written on 4th October that Sir Walter Blount, treasurer of Calais, was then besieging the castle and that every day there was "great war, either part to other";[4] but before the end of that month Hammes was won by the same means that had conquered Guines. One Angelo Tany, or Tagny, a Florentine merchant who had loaned money to the Dauphin Louis while Louis was Philip of Burgundy's guest,[5] paid two hundred and fifty pounds in Blount's name to the "rebels" in the castle, and then, after some of the rebels had stolen away to France, Hammes submitted to Edward IV.[6]

The surrender of Hammes did not put an end to all anxiety about Calais and its pale, for the French were always too near. Moreover, in no part of Edward's realm was the emptiness of his purse so keenly felt as at Calais. Blount came over to England several times to tell the king and his council of the "excessive indigence and importable poverty" of the garrison and to ask that wages should be paid promptly; but although by his importunities he at last obtained, on 17th March, 1462, the sum of two thousand pounds, the money had to be borrowed from Angelo Tany and Simon Nori, and three years after the surrender of Hammes as much as £1849 2*s.* 9*d.* ob. was still owing to Blount for the wages of the soldiers who had served at the siege of that castle.[1]

---

[1] Account Book of Richard Whetehill, comptroller of Calais, 1 and 2 Edw. IV, Exchequer Accounts, France, bundle 196, no. 2. Cf. Beaucourt, VI, 333.

[2] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 89.

[3] French Roll 1 Edw. IV, m. 32.

[4] Paston Letters, *ut sup.*

[5] Legeay, Histoire de Louis XI, I, 213; MS. français 6965, f. 151.

[6] Foreign Roll 3 Edw. IV, m. E; Issue Roll, Mich. 1 Edw. IV, 30th Oct. and 7th Dec.; Chancery Miscellaneous Rolls, bundle 20, no. 12; Account Book of Richard Whetehill, *ut sup.* The surrender of Hammes appears to have taken place on 25th October, as Edward, when appointing commissioners to inquire what wages, etc., Henry VI had owed at Calais, Guines, and Hammes on the last day of his reign, directed that the reckoning should be extended in the case of Hammes to 25th October following. Chancery Miscellanea, bundle 2, no. 50.

---

[1] Foreign Roll and Chancery Miscellanea, *ut sup.*; Issue Roll, Mich. 1 Edw. IV, 17th March.

CHAPTER IV

FOREIGN RELATIONS AND FIRST PARLIAMENT

WHILE England was gradually submitting to Edward of York, Henry of Lancaster's plight was pitiful enough. Margaret and the Prince of Wales were still at Edinburgh, but Henry himself seems to have been staying at Kirkcudbright, and they were all reduced to such poverty that the wolf was kept from the door only by the charity of Scotland's rulers and by such help as Sir John Fortescue and a few other faithful friends, who were almost as destitute as they were, could give them.[1] Nor was their poverty the only trouble Henry and Margaret were facing. To add to their discomfort, it looked more and more as if Edward and Warwick would soon obtain a truce with Scotland in spite of all that they could say or do, and also in spite of the fact that the Bishop of St. Andrews still urged that help should be given to the house of Lancaster. For on 24th September Edward granted a safeconduct for the Bishop of Aberdeen, the Earl of Orkney, Lord Hamilton, Duncan of Dundas, and other Scots, and these ambassadors seem to have reached London early in October.[2]

If Margaret could no longer count with certainty on Scotland, no more could she count on France. In fact, it was the turn events had taken in France that threatened to rob her of the support of Scotland. If Charles VII had given her little direct aid, at least he had always been friendly and ready to urge others to do her the kindnesses he did not find it convenient to do for her himself; but now Charles no longer ruled over France, and his son had not only imprisoned her envoys, but had sent her friend Brezé to languish in that gloomiest of prisons, Loches.[3] Hungerford and Whitingham had written hopefully, but the summons to Louis' presence did not come as soon as they expected. This did not mean that the new king of France was above changing sides, nor that the position he now occupied did not dictate that he should change sides. For although it had pleased Louis, while he was Dauphin, to league himself with his father's enemies in England and elsewhere, now that he himself wore the crown of France all the traditions of his house, all the painful history of more than a hundred years past, bade him adopt the same policy that his father had followed. So well did he know this that, though Lord Wenlock, Sir John Clay, and the Dean of St. Severin's crossed to Calais very soon after they received their commission from Edward on 8th August and sent to Louis to ask for safeconducts, they were given no opportunity to attend the coronation at Rheims nor to meet the new king of France at any other place.[1] But the Duke of Burgundy remained in Paris throughout the month of September, and although the Count of Charolais pleaded with Louis for his friend Somerset, the presence of Philip, who indignantly refused to listen to all invitations to break off his cordial relations with Edward,[2] sufficed to prevent Louis from showing any sign of relenting towards Margaret's ambassadors.

---

[1] Paston Letters, III, 307; letter from Henry to the king of France, Waurin, III, 169-170, note.

[2] Rymer, XI, 476; Paston Letters, III, 312.

[3] Coulon, Fragment d'une chronique, 125-126; Chastellain, IV, 184.

Philip of Burgundy was not the only enemy Margaret of Anjou had at Louis XI's court in the first days of his reign. Coppini too was there, and he probably brought all his influence to bear against her. However, Coppini's diplomatic career was nearing an end. With the excuse that an embassy was expected from Edward IV and that before that embassy arrived the papal ear ought to hear from Coppini himself a full account of all that had happened in England, the Pope had summoned his legate to Rome. Even Coppini's legatine powers had been taken from him and transferred to Jean Jouffroy, Bishop of Arras, partly because, as Pius explained, the Bishop of Arras was sure to be acceptable both to the king of France and to the Duke of Burgundy, and partly because, being more thoroughly acquainted with the tongue and manners of the French people than any foreigner could be, he would probably be better able than Coppini to bring about that union of the princes of Europe against the Turks which his Holiness still so earnestly desired.[1] But Coppini was afterwards given permission to postpone his departure for Rome should the Bishop of Arras wish him to do so, and, as it turned out, Jouffroy decided to make use of him in England again. On 23rd September Coppini wrote to the Duke of Milan that, as the Pope wanted to make some agreement between the kings of England and of France and as Edward had shown that his presence would be agreeable to him, the Bishop of Arras had decided to send him over to England "while the iron is hot" to give the negotiations a start. In a month at most, Coppini thought, his work would be done, as both kings were in favour of his journey.[2]

---

[1] Camuglio wrote to the Duke of Milan from Rheims on 13th August that the English embassy was then at Calais and had sent to ask for safeconducts, but that he doubted if it would come to Rheims. Mandrot, Dépêches des ambassadeurs milanais, I, 46. On the other hand, Edward's order for the payment of his ambassadors states that in their "going and coming" they had continued eighty-two days, i.e., from 1st September till 21st November. Writs of Privy Seal, file 789, no. 743 (a document which properly belongs among the Warrants for Issues). Moreover, Paston was told on 4th October that Wenlock, Clay, and Taster had been at Calais three weeks "abiding a safeconduct going upon an ambassate to the French king."

[2] Chastellain, IV, 68-69, 122 *et seq.*

A few days after Coppini wrote his letter to Sforza, Louis XI left Paris, and on the last day of September the Duke of Burgundy started for home.[3] No sooner had Philip departed than Louis sent for Margaret of Anjou's ambassadors to meet him at Tours, and when they arrived, he treated them with marked friendliness. When the Count of Charolais came to Tours on 22nd October, the Duke of Somerset was one of those whom Louis sent to meet and welcome him.[4] But although Charolais again pleaded for his friend Somerset, Louis' graciousness did not extend to the granting of any very substantial favours, probably because at this moment Louis Galet appeared on the scene. News of the presence of Margaret's ambassadors at Tours could not be kept from Edward, and Galet, who was now a member of the king's council, was sent post haste to "our realm of France" on 16th October and remained there on guard until 13th February.[5] All that Somerset got from Louis, consequently, was a license to depart where he would and a gift of gold and silver. Forced to be content with this, the duke finally set out for Scotland, but on learning that some of Edward's men were lying in wait for him, he turned back to Bruges, where Philip of Burgundy, out of consideration for his son's friendship for him, suffered him to stay, although the English merchants residing there resented his presence and on one occasion expressed their resentment by engaging in a serious street fight with some of his men.[1]

---

[1] See two letters from Pius to Coppini which were written in August or September, Vatican Transcripts, portfolio 62, and also one from Sforza's ambassador at Rome, Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 105. Pius did not overestimate the advantages of the Bishop of Arras as a diplomat. It was Jouffroy who secured from Louis XI in this year the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction. But as he secured it by promising that Pius would give the investiture of the kingdom of Naples to the Duke of Calabria, a thing which Pius had no thought of doing, Louis afterwards took back his promise, and the Pragmatic Sanction continued to be recognized as law in France. Perret, Hist. des relations de la France avec Venise, I, 377, 387-389; Legeay, I, 291 *et seq.*

[2] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 104-105; Cal. Venetian Papers, I, 112.

[3] Commynes-Lenglet, II, 174.

[4] *Ibid.*; Chastellain, IV, 69; Du Clercq, liv. IV, c. xxxviii.

[5] Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 18th Feb. Cf. Issue Roll, Mich. 1 Edw. IV, 17th March. Antonio della Torre stated in a letter written to Coppini on 25th March that Galet was then in Calais and would return to King Louis.

Another thing which Galet's trip to Tours seems to have accomplished was the liberation of the prisoners whom Margaret had repeatedly begged Charles VII to deliver up to her. Forster and Malpas were probably sufficiently well-to-do to be able to pay their ransoms without help, but on 28th October Edward granted William Hatclyf forty pounds "in relieving him towards his finance and losses borne and sustained of late by our enemies of France, in whose hands he was taken prisoner as he, of the occasion and dread of our adversary party and rebels, in eschewing of their malice and tyrannous deeds and saving of his life, took his passage over the sea, as we understand."[2] And Thomas Vaughan got from the king, probably at the same time, a promise of no less than two hundred pounds towards his ransom.[3] But this was a small price for Edward to pay for the release of two such valuable men as Vaughan and Hatclyf; for Hatclyf, who had once looked after the health of Henry VI, soon became one of Edward's own physicians, and both he and Vaughan proved to be particularly skilful in difficult diplomatic undertakings. In fact, Vaughan was scarcely set at liberty when he was employed on an embassy to Louis XI himself.

If Edward was beginning to fear that Louis' accession to the throne was going to cause a change in Louis' attitude towards him,

---

Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 107. Galet is spoken of as one of the king's councillors in a grant made to him on 12th August of a tenement in the lordship of Marck and Oye. French Roll 1 Edw. IV, m. 24. He was probably a member of the council in Calais. From the same grant it appears that he had been in the service of the kings of England in England and France for about forty-four years.

[1] Du Clercq, *ut sup.;* Commynes-Lenglet, II, 175; Waurin, II, 314, note; Gilliodts-van-Severen, Inventaire des archives de la Ville de Bruges, V, 431.

[2] Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 28th Oct.

[3] In a warrant of 16th September, 1462, Edward told the officers of the Exchequer that as he had given Thomas Vaughan, "squire for our body," £200 towards his finance and £100 of that amount had not yet been paid, they were to make him an assignment of £100 on the tenth granted by the clergy of the province of Canterbury. Warrants for Issues, 2 Edw. IV, 16th Sept. Cf. Issue Roll, Mich. 2 Edw. IV, 7th Oct.

he felt that he had all the more reason to look for unwavering friendship from Philip of Burgundy. For it would be more than ever to Philip's advantage to have a firm friend on the throne of England if Louis was going to shake off his former friends and associates. But as Louis had not seen fit to welcome them to France, Lord Wenlock and his colleagues had had to wait patiently at Calais until they could meet Philip on his own territory. It was not until the second week in October, when the duke was on his way home from Paris, that the English ambassadors met him by appointment at Valenciennes.

Philip, who was famous for the magnificence of his hospitality, had luxurious lodgings prepared for the Englishmen, and he sent the Bishop of Tournai and some of the members of his council to receive them as they approached Valenciennes and another notable delegation to bid them welcome when they entered the town. On the following evening, when they were summoned to an audience with the duke and were received " moult hautement et de grand cœur," the ambassadors showed their credentials and in the most flattering terms expressed the thanks of their king for Philip's favours in the past and his hope that the duke's friendship for him would continue.[1] This was in public audience. The next day in secret conference with the duke's councillors the Englishmen made known their more specific messages. Their king, they said, was not only powerful, but young, handsome, and unmarried, and he was full of affection for the house of Burgundy. The duke had in his household a niece, Mademoiselle de Bourbon, the sister of the Countess of Charolais, a beautiful young lady who had been brought up at his court, and a marriage alliance binding England and Burgundy together, the ambassadors suggested, would redound to the " grand joye et grand paix " of both countries. But while Philip certainly rejoiced in Edward's success, he was not ready to enter into a marriage alliance with a king who had only just won his crown by means of civil war. Henry VI still lived, and Henry had a son. Anyone who bound himself to Edward by a marriage tie would almost inevitably be drawn into his war with Henry; and though fortune smiled on Edward now, fortune, being a fickle goddess, might change her mind and smile on Henry later on. So Philip drew back when a marriage alliance was proposed. But he gladly agreed to a year's prolongation of the truce and intercourse of merchandise between England and Burgundy, and through his agency arrangements were also made with Louis for a meeting of French, English, and Burgundian ambassadors at Bruges, St. Omer, or Lille to try to negotiate a treaty between England and France.[1] If Louis signed a treaty with Edward, everything would be different, for then Henry VI could never hope to recover his throne and a marriage alliance with the house of York would be a perfectly safe venture.

---

[1] Chastellain, who was eager to add to Philip's renown in every way, asserts that Edward caused his ambassadors to say to the duke that " de sa main et nulle autre, après Dieu, il tenoit et possessoit la couronne d'Angleterre." But Waurin, although he too puts some fulsome flattery into the mouths of the English ambassadors, does not credit them with any such statement.

Philip's offer to try to arrange a treaty between England and France may have been made in part to satisfy the Bishop of Arras. For the bishop, as well as Edward's ambassadors, had come to Valenciennes by the duke's appointment, and he seized the opportunity to labour both with Philip and with the Englishmen on behalf of the Pope's crusade. Philip had long been ambitious to be the leader of a crusade, and he at once expressed his more than willingness to unite with the other princes of Christendom in a great effort to annihilate the infamous Turks. But while Philip was present to speak for himself, the king of England was not, and Edward's ambassadors wisely refused to make any promises for him. To an harangue in Latin delivered by the Bishop of Arras the Dean of St. Severin's replied, in French, that he and his colleagues had not been authorized by their king, who knew nothing of the bishop's presence at Valenciennes, to treat regarding the crusade. And the only promise the dean could be induced to make was that when he and his colleagues went home, they would lay the Pope's wishes before Edward, who was a truly Christian prince and not likely to let the king of France and the Duke of Burgundy outdo him in good works.[2]

Philip entertained Edward's ambassadors at his own expense throughout their stay at Valenciennes, and before they took their leave he gave in their honour one of the costly banquets in which he delighted. The Englishmen were seated at the duke's own table, Wenlock on one side of him and Clay, who was wearing

---

[1] Chastellain, IV, 155-160; Waurin, II, 310-313. The truce between England and Burgundy was prorogued until All Saints' Day, 1462. Rymer, XI, 497. Apparently for a moment Louis urged, or pretended to urge, Philip to accept Edward's marriage proposal. See Mandrot, Dépêches des ambassadeurs milanais, I, 196.

[2] Chastellain, IV, 161-164.

Edward's new collar of the white rose and the sun, on the other, and so sumptuous was the cheer that they had to admit that never in their lives had they seen the like. Nor was the magnificent duke content to let the representatives of the king of England depart with only a banquet. As he was leaving Valenciennes, he sent a gift of silver vessels to their lodgings, and his guests had to mount their horses and follow after him in order to find an opportunity to express their thanks. Even one more surprise was in store for the much honoured Englishmen, for when they rode back to Valenciennes, they found that luxurious baths had been prepared for them by the duke's orders.[1]

After Philip had left Valenciennes, Wenlock, Taster, and Clay returned to Calais, and from Calais they went back to England, arriving in London on 21st November. They had been away a good many weeks and as Wenlock was entitled to forty shillings a day for his services and Clay and Taster to twenty shillings a day each, and as twenty pounds had to be allowed also for their "shipping to and fro," their bills were so large, in spite of the Duke of Burgundy's hospitality, that the scantily filled treasury had to pay them in instalments.[2] But the money, if slow in forthcoming, was not begrudged; for although the ambassadors had not brought back a promise of a bride for the king, through their labours Philip of Burgundy's friendship for the house of York had been confirmed and strengthened and the first step had been taken towards a treaty with Louis XI. So anxious was Edward to keep what had been gained that, even before his ambassadors reached home, he had commissioned Wenlock, Taster, and the Prior of St. John's to hear and determine complaints of infractions of the truce with Burgundy.[3] And when a Burgundian knight came over to England, Edward presented him with twenty-five marks by the hand of Garter King-of-Arms. This knight probably came to ask for a safeconduct for the Seigneur de la Gruthuyse, who was not less renowned for his prowess in the lists than for his skill in diplomacy and who wanted to come to England to tilt with Sir Ralph Grey. The safeconduct was granted on 4th December.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, IV, 164-166. Cf. Waurin, II, 313.

[2] Writs of Privy Seal, file 789, no. 743; Issue Roll, Mich. 1 Edw. IV, 30th Oct., 12th Nov., and 30th Jan.; Issue Roll, Easter 2 Edw. IV, 21st July and 17th August. Clay and Taster each received £5 over and above their wages as their share of the allowance for shipping, and according to the indorsement on the warrant, Wenlock received £69 18*s.* 4*d.* in addition to his wages, which amounted to £164. Part of this additional sum must have been for shipping. Very likely the rest had been expended in "tips."

[3] Rymer, XI, 478. On 22nd December Edward gave orders for the payment of £20 to one John Waynflete for his diligence and costs in taking one John White who had lately committed certain great offences against the laws and against the league and amity with the Duke of Burgundy. Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 22nd Dec.

The opening of negotiations with Louis XI was of value to Edward in more ways than one; for when the king of France evinced willingness to accept a treaty with him, there was little danger that Scotland would reject his advances. The Bishop of Aberdeen and the other Scottish ambassadors who had come to London in October remained in England some time, and Edward did all that he could to win their good-will by defraying their expenses during their stay at his court, by distributing among them at their departure gifts of cloth of silver, crimson cloth, and black figured satin, as well as a reward of forty-five pounds, and by sending Windsor Herald to escort them on their homeward way.[2] Apparently James's ambassadors had not brought authority to sign a treaty, but Edward gave a commission to Lord Ogle to conclude a year's truce with Scotland to begin on St. Martin's Day (11th November); and a new safeconduct granted to the same Scottish ambassadors, with the addition of the Bishop of Glasgow, on 4th November was probably intended to enable them to remain in the north of England and negotiate with Ogle.[3] But in the meantime no precautions were being omitted on the border and not only were more ships being fitted out for use in case of need, but an effort was being made to array the men of the northernmost counties for defence, as the commissions stated, against the Scots and against Henry, Margaret, and their adherents.[4]

Edward's hold on the throne of England was evidently gaining strength with every day that passed, but even now it was not so assured that he could afford to give his attention to the Turks. No doubt Wenlock, Clay, and Taster kept the promise they had made to the Bishop of Arras at Valenciennes to speak to Edward about the Pope's wish to organize a crusade; and even at the moment that promise was being given, Coppini was in England again and endeavouring to further Pius's plans by bringing about some agreement between Edward and Louis. But not even the wishes of the Pope or the influence of Coppini could hasten the negotiations between Edward and Louis which Philip of Burgundy had only just succeeded in starting, and however anxious Edward might be to act as the truly Christian prince his ambassadors had said he was, it was out of the question for him to give either men or money for a crusade at the present time.

---

[1] Issue Roll, Mich. 1 Edw. IV, 12th Nov.; Chancery Miscellaneous Rolls, bundle 20, no. 12; Rymer, XI, 481.

[2] Issue Roll, Mich. 1 Edw. IV, 7th Nov.; Cal. Documents relating to Scotland, IV, 270. This was probably the occasion of the visit of Windsor Herald to Edinburgh which is mentioned in the Exchequer Rolls of Scotland, VII, 147.

[3] Rymer, XI, 477; Rotuli Scotiæ, II, 403.

[4] Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 20th Oct.; Issue Roll, Mich. 1 Edw. IV, 20th Oct., 7th and 26th Nov.; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 66, 101.

So it happened that Coppini's last mission to England, like his first, ended in failure. And with that failure vanished the last trace of his rosy visions of the great things England was to do for the Holy See under the guidance of Edward and Warwick, and of the glory he himself was to gain therefrom. Pius had now peremptorily summoned his former legate to Rome, and to Rome Coppini went at last with fear and trembling. Edward did not forget that he had reason to be grateful both to Coppini and to Coppini's friend, Francesco Sforza, and before Coppini left England he made him his agent at Rome, granted him an annuity of a hundred pounds, and gave his nephews, Bartholomew and Thomas Coppini, and their heirs male the privilege of bearing a white rose in the upper part of their shield of arms.[1] But neither the honours bestowed on him by the king of England nor the influence exerted on his behalf by the Duke of Milan, to whom Edward soon gave the Garter as an expression of thanks for his friendship,[2] availed Coppini anything on his arrival at Rome. No more did the golden vessels and precious gems gleaned in England which he distributed among those enjoying influence at the pontifical court. He was imprisoned in the castle of St. Angelo, where he finally made a full confession concerning his abuse of his legation, his bishopric was taken from him, and he ended his days as an exemplary monk in the Benedictine monastery of St. Paul at Rome. He made a better monk than bishop, was the indignant Pius's verdict upon him.[3]

It was Margaret of Anjou who had brought about the downfall of Coppini, but she profited nothing by his disgrace. By the hands of Coppini or some other agent Edward had sent to Rome an exposition of his hereditary right to the English throne, and at the end of March, 1462, he received a benignant letter from Pius in which the Pope congratulated him upon his elevation to the throne, expressed his confidence in him, and blessed him.[1] Even such a pope as Æneas Sylvius could not see that it was his duty to quarrel with a victorious king for the sake of a dethroned one.

---

[1] Rymer, XI, 479; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 59. See also Issue Roll, Mich. 1 Edw. IV, 22nd and 25th Feb., and Chancery Miscellaneous Rolls, *ut sup.* Apparently the annuity was not paid after the first year.

[2] Apparently in March, 1462. See Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 108.

[3] Gobellinus, 277-278.

While Coppini was still in England, the first parliament of Edward IV had assembled at Westminster. The king came up from Greenwich on 30th October[2] in part to be ready for the opening ceremonies and in part for another purpose, which was to give a dukedom to his brother Richard, as he had already given one to his brother George. Richard received his new honours, with the title of Duke of Gloucester, on All Hallows' Day,[3] and not long after both he and Clarence were made knights of the Garter. There is no record of the chapter at which the two young dukes were elected to the Order of the Garter, but their election certainly took place before 4th February, 1462, as on that date Edward gave directions for the delivery of "a helme, a crest, and a sword" to his brother Gloucester "to be set in the chapel of our College of Saint George within our castle of Windsor, according for him to the honour and order of the Garter." Yet the Garter itself, which was made by Matthew Philip, a London goldsmith, at a cost of thirty pounds, was not actually delivered to Richard until four years later.[4] The new duke was still too young to take part in affairs of state, and although he was soon wearing, in addition to his ducal title, that of admiral of England, Ireland, and Aquitaine,[5] he seems to have spent the next few years of his life in the household of the Earl of Warwick, an excellent training school for a young scion of the royal house.[6]

---

[1] Rymer, XI, 489.

[2] Privy Seals.

[3] Rymer, XI, 476; Fabyan, 652; Hearne's Fragment, 289; Kingsford's London Chron., 177. These chronicles state that Viscount Bourchier was created Earl of Essex and Lord Fauconberg Earl of Kent at the same time, but this is incorrect, at least as far as Bourchier is concerned.

[4] Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 4th Feb.; Tellers' Roll, Mich. 5 Edw. IV. See also an account appended to Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 1st March.

[5] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 214. Even earlier Richard seems to have borne the title of "maris admirallus." See *ibid.*, I, 197, and Signed Bills, file 1491, no. 3810.

[6] In Michaelmas term 5 Edw. IV, Warwick received a thousand pounds from the wardship and marriage of Lord Lovel's son and heir because of the costs and expenses "per ipsum factum super dominum Ducem Gloucestrie fratrem Regis ac super exhibitionem suam, etc." Tellers' Roll, Mich. 5 Edw. IV (no. 36), m. 2. See also the account appended to Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 1st March. It appears that at some time the Archbishop of Canterbury supported both of Edward's brothers "for a long time at great charges." Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 295-296.

As England was gaining one duke, she lost another. Edward had summoned but one duke to his first parliament, and that was his kinsman and friend, John Mowbray, Duke of Norfolk. But Norfolk died two days after the parliament was opened, and as his heir, another John Mowbray, was a minor, the great Mowbray estates passed temporarily into the keeping of the king.[1] Among the earls who came to Westminster in November, 1461, there were two, the Earls of Essex and Kent, who had been advanced to that rank since the writs of summons were sent out on 23rd May. Of the earls of Henry VI's reign only four, the Earls of Warwick, Oxford, Arundel, and Westmoreland, had been summoned, and of these the Earl of Oxford probably availed himself of a license to absent himself from parliament on account of his age and infirmities which had been granted to him before Henry's last parliament. But there was one other earl of Henry's reign who sat in Edward's first parliament, although he had not been summoned to it. That John Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester, had been overlooked when the writs of summons were issued must have been due to the fact that he had been absent for some time past on a visit to Italy, the Holy Land, and other foreign parts. For although Worcester owed his earldom to Henry VI, whom he had at one time served as treasurer, he had been an adherent of the Duke of York, and happening to return home at the beginning of September, he took his seat in the House of Lords when parliament met and was named one of the triers of petitions.[2] The returned traveller was so welcome an addition to the Yorkist ranks that on 1st November he was made a member of the king's council with a salary of two hundred marks, later in the same month justice of North Wales, in December constable of the Tower, on 7th February, 1462, constable of England, and soon after a knight of the Garter.[3]

When parliament was opened on 4th November in the Painted Chamber, the chancellor discoursed on the highly appropriate text, "Amend your ways and your doings." On the third day the Commons presented Sir James Strangways of Yorkshire, a connection of the Nevilles,[1] as their Speaker; and on the ninth day, when the real work of the session began, Strangways delivered a congratulatory address to the king in which he dwelt on the king's prowess at Mortimer's Cross, on his hurried march from Wales to London, when Queen Margaret was destroying the land, on his assumption of the crown to which his birth entitled him, and on his march into the north and his victory at Towton. Yet to his words of flattery, which included a delicate reference to "the beauty of personage that it hath pleased Almighty God to send you," the Speaker appended some sound advice which, if it had been carefully followed in after years, would have saved both Edward and England much trouble. Your humble subjects, Strangways told Edward in effect, beseech you to take into your confidence such persons as have merited your favour by assisting you to establish your right to the throne; and they "hold for certain and undoubted" that you will see to it that the crimes which have been rife in the country during Henry VI's reign are punished and that justice and right are maintained.[2]

---

[1] Reports touching Dignity of a Peer, IV, 9, 51; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 162; Paston Letters, I, 215. Fabyan and others place Norfolk's death one day too early. Wenlock was made governor of the new duke during his minority. Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 105, 112.

[2] Chron. of John Stone, 84; Rolls of Parl., V, 461.

[3] Issue Roll, Easter 3 Edw. IV, 23rd June; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 61, 62, 74; Beltz, Order of the Garter, clxiii.

When the Speaker had thus voiced the loyalty of the Commons to the new king and expressed their hope that he would govern England better than Henry of Lancaster had governed it, the next step was to give the proper sanction to his seizure of the throne. For this purpose a lengthy petition was presented in which the Commons, after declaring that the son of Richard, Duke of York, had inherited the crown from the murdered Richard II and after characterizing Henry VI as an "unrightwise usurper" in whose time there had been nothing but war and crime, announced that they held Edward IV to be their liege and sovereign lord "by God's law, man's law, and law of nature" and prayed that his right to the crown might be declared by an act of parliament, that all alienations of royal lands by the late usurpers might be cancelled by an act of resumption, and that the heirs of the body of "Henry, late Earl of Derby," might be pronounced unable and unworthy to hold or inherit any estate, dignity, or possession within the realm. Finally, recalling the compact between Henry VI and the Duke of York, the Commons lauded the self-denial of the duke—"not then having any lord above him but God"—and, on the ground that Henry had broken the compact long before 4th

---

[1] Stubbs, III, 200.

[2] Rolls of Parl., V, 462-463.

March, 1461, asked that it should be declared null and void.[1]

The Commons' petition was approved by the Lords and accepted by the king, but before he signed it, Edward modified that part of it which provided for a general resumption of royal lands by adding no less than eighty-nine exemption clauses saving the rights of certain persons and corporations that he considered to be deserving of his favour or clemency. But though it is evident that Edward meant to be generous, the eighty-nine exemption clauses did not save all who thought they ought to be spared. The chronicler of St. Albans has left a graphic account of the dismay felt at his monastery, which had already suffered so much from the civil war, when it was discovered that it was likely to lose St. Andrew's Priory at Pembroke in consequence of the act of resumption. The aged abbot, whose infirmities had kept him away from the parliament, hurried his archdeacon off to Westminster, but it took more than five weeks of anxious effort, and also the intercession of the chancellor of England, to secure a regrant of the priory. Perhaps it is little to be wondered at that he who tells the story accuses the Commons of having acted in the matter of resumption of the royal lands "non multum circumspecte nec omnino cum matura deliberatione."[2]

The recognition of Edward's hereditary right to the throne and the declaration that the kings of the house of Lancaster had been mere usurpers made necessary certain protective legislation. For unless the validity of certain acts of the last three kings was acknowledged and established beyond question, much injustice and distress must inevitably result. To prevent this, parliament proceeded to confirm all judicial acts of the preceding reigns not done "by authority of any parliament," all patents creating titles, all franchises and other grants made to municipalities, guilds, and crafts, all presentations to benefices, all assignments of dower, and many other acts of a similar nature. But, strangely enough, the question of the validity of the laws enacted since the seizure of the crown by Henry IV either was not brought up or, if brought up, was set aside without attempt to answer it.[3]

Another inevitable accompaniment of the change of dynasty was the attainder of the leading supporters of the deposed king. The Yorkists who had been attainted at Coventry in 1459 were now

[1] Rolls of Parl., V, 463-475.

[2] Whethamstede, I, 416-418.

[3] Rolls of Parl., V, 489-493; Statute 1 Edw. IV, c. 1; Stubbs, III, 202.

able to take full revenge, and they did not neglect their opportunity. The bill of attainder was introduced by the Lords and, contrary to the prevailing custom, was given the form of a statute instead of that of a petition.[1] The list of those to be attainted was headed by Henry, "calling himself King Henry the Sixth," Margaret, "late called queen of England," and Edward, *her* son; and Henry's patrimonial duchy of Lancaster, with its vast estates not only in Lancashire but in Yorkshire and many other parts of England, was declared forfeit. The most notable of Henry's adherents, living and dead, who had the honour of suffering attainder with him were the Dukes of Somerset and Exeter, the Earls of Devonshire, Northumberland, Pembroke, and Wiltshire, Viscount Beaumont,[2] Lords Roos, Clifford, Hungerford, Welles, Neville, and Rugemont-Grey, Lord Dacre of Gillesland and his brother Humphrey, Sir John Fortescue, Sir Andrew Trollope, Sir William Tailboys, Sir Alexander Hody,[3] Sir Baldwin Fulford, Sir Edmund Mountfort, Sir Robert Whitingham, Sir Henry Bellingham, Sir Thomas Findern,[4] Sir John Heron of the Forde, Sir Richard Tunstall, Sir William Holland, Bastard of Exeter, Humphrey Neville of Brancepeth, and Doctor John Morton. Finally, the attainder of Sir John Skydmore, the defender of Pembroke Castle, was secured by a special clause appended to the general bill but though Sir John's lands were to be forfeited to the king, his "life, goods, and chattels" were granted to him in accordance with the promise Lord Herbert had given him at the time of his surrender, and it was provided that he should not be "prejudiced nor hurt in his person by imprisonment or jeopardy of his life."[5] By a separate enactment those who were still holding Harlech Castle for Henry were also summoned to surrender and condemned to forfeiture of their goods, and seven other rebels were threatened with conviction of treason if they did not submit before a certain day.[1]

---

[1] Rolls of Parl., V, 476-483; Stubbs, III, 202.

[2] Beaumont succeeded in obtaining a general pardon from Edward two days before Christmas, but he was not restored in blood and honours until the accession of Henry VII. Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 86; Nicolas, Hist. Peerage.

[3] Hody had died on 16th May. Inquisitions *post mortem*, 1 Edw. IV, no. 34.

[4] Formerly lieutenant of Guines Castle. Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 22, etc.

[5] According to Skydmore's own story, as he told it eleven years later, when he obtained the reversal of his attainder, his name was first placed in the general bill but was struck out by the Commons on account of the promise made to him at the time he surrendered Pembroke Castle. After that, he claimed, a special bill for his attainder which was brought before the Lords was rejected for the same reason, but finally, at the close of the parliament, after some of the members had departed, "by marvellous private labour" a bill signed by the king was brought to the Commons which provided that he should forfeit his livelihood, "only saving to him his life and goods." Rolls of Parl., VI, 29-30.

In addition to punishing those who had been guilty of loyalty to the house of Lancaster, Edward IV's first parliament declared the sentence pronounced against his grandfather, the Earl of Cambridge, when he plotted to dethrone Henry V and make the then Earl of March king, to be "damned and of no force or effect." At the same time the attainders of John Montagu, Earl of Shrewsbury, and Thomas, Lord le Despenser, dating back to the second year of the reign of Henry IV, were reversed for the benefit of their heirs, the Earl of Warwick and his mother, and that of Ralph, Lord Lumley, fellow sufferer with Shrewsbury and Despenser, was also reversed upon the petition of his grandson.

To the attainder of his enemies Edward gave ready assent, but one petition presented by the Commons he declined to sanction. The merchants of the staple of Calais, if the chronicler Fabyan is to be believed, had advanced no less than eighteen thousand pounds to Edward and Warwick when they were at Calais and laying plans for their invasion of England; and the same merchants had laid Edward under further obligations to them by loaning him another thousand pounds soon after his coronation. Yet now when those merchants asked for the ratification of acts of parliament passed during the preceding reigns to insure to them the repayment of money loaned by them to the late kings or paid out by them in wages to the captain and soldiers of Calais, and also for the ratification of payments made to them by the customs officers under warrants of Henry VI and of Edward himself, their petition was "respited."[2]

At first glance this act of the king has a very ugly look. And an ugly look, too, has Fabyan's statement that Edward refused to repay the eighteen thousand pounds advanced to him and Warwick at Calais. But as we shall find that care was taken in the following year to satisfy the claims of the staplers against the crown, then amounting to nearly forty-one thousand pounds, it seems only fair to conclude that their petition was "respited" now in order to give time for a full investigation of their claims. As for the eighteen thousand pounds, Fabyan says—and his account of the matter is the only one we have—that the king's council said that that money, "with much more, the which was covertly kept from the king's knowledge, belonged of right unto the Earl of Wiltshire, which at the time of delivery of the said goods was high treasurer of England, and after, for treason by him done against the king, the said earl's lands and goods were forfeited unto the king; wherefore the king retained the said eighteen thousand pounds as parcel of his forfeiture, and would retain as his own."[1]

---

[1] Rolls of Parl., V, 486.

[2] *Ibid.*, V, 491.

In reality the aggrieved parties in the matter of the eighteen thousand pounds appear to have been the Earl of Wiltshire—or rather the Earl of Wiltshire's heirs, as the earl himself was now dead—and Wiltshire's agent, Richard Heyron of London,[2] a man who, in 1460, before Edward and Warwick went to Calais, had brought suit before the council of Henry VI against certain of his fellow staplers on a complaint that they had prevented the sale of some wools belonging to him, and who was even then in trouble and in prison.[3] For apparently most or all of the money which Edward and Warwick took was the property of the Earl of Wiltshire—a part of that earl's stealings from the subjects of Henry VI—and was in the keeping of this man Heyron.[4] And it was by Heyron, who seems to have escaped from his prison to the Westminster sanctuary in the meantime, not by the society of the merchants of the staple, that "great suit and labour" was made to Edward to repay the money; and it was Heyron who received the reply already quoted.[5]

When the king refused to repay the money, Heyron turned to the staplers and demanded that they should do so;[6] and when they too refused, as they would naturally refuse a demand coming from a man who had already gone to law with them, he seems to have sought revenge by pressing by fair means and foul the suit he had formerly brought against them. For one thing, he caused three of the staplers to be arrested in Flanders and proceeded to prosecute them in the court of the Duke of Burgundy at Bruges.[1] On 5th March, 1463, formal notification was given under the great seal of England that the king and the great council were competent judges and prepared to do justice in the matter between Heyron and the staplers, the documents relating to the case as brought before King Henry's council in 1460 being recited,[2] and Heyron seems to have been ordered at that time to desist from further action outside the kingdom;[3] but, in spite of all, he continued his suit in the ducal court for a long time, claiming that he had a license from the king to do so, and afterwards, by appeal, in the court of the Parliament of Paris.[4] Later on, probably after amicable relations had been established between the kings of France and England by the treaty of 1475, the king of France decided that Heyron's case belonged to the jurisdiction of the king of England and dismissed it. But even then Heyron did not give in, although all this time, apparently, he was in the sanctuary at Westminster. He now appealed to the Pope, and although in 1478 the parliament of England ordered proclamation to be made in the city of London that he must "surcease" his suit against the merchants of the staple out of the realm of England, and that if he failed to obey he would be "put out of the king's protection" and forfeit all of his lands and goods;[5] although the Roman court, like the Parliament of Paris, referred his suit back to England, and although through the king's procurator at Rome he was now warned that he must bring his suit back to England within a certain time, he not only did not obey, but appealed to the Apostolic See a second time. And this time his appeal was so successful that in November, 1480, he obtained from Sixtus IV an annullatory bull against the merchants of the staple[6] which, according to Fabyan, denounced the merchants as

---

[1] Fabyan, 653. Edward carefully provided for the repayment of a much smaller loan made to him by one of the staplers while he was at Calais. Writs of Privy Seal, file 790, no. 895; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 182.

[2] Apparently he is not to be identified with the Richard Heron, merchant of the staple, mentioned in Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 596.

[3] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 275-276.

[4] "As much of the said good belonged to his [Heyron's] charge," are Fabyan's words.

[5] Fabyan is uncertain whether Heyron was speaking merely for himself or for all of the staplers.

[6] Fabyan.

---

[1] Rolls of Parl., VI, 182-183.

[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 275-276.

[3] See the reply which the king's council made to Heyron in February, 1482. French Roll 21 Edw. IV, m. 1-3.

[4] Rolls of Parl., *ut sup.* Heyron's appeal to the Parliament of Paris was evidently made some time before 1470, for in a pamphlet which Sir John Fortescue sent to Louis XI in that year in the hope of persuading him to help to restore Henry VI to the English throne, the chief justice suggested, according to a contemporary epitome of the document, that any money which Louis spent in Henry's cause could easily be recovered "au moyen dung proces que Richart Henon, angloys, pursuit en la court de Parlement, mais que le roy lui veuille donner faveur." Works of Sir John Fortescue, I, 35.

[5] Rolls of Parl., *ut sup.*; Cal. Patent Rolls, III, 67.

[6] French Roll, *ut sup.*

"accursed." However, if Heyron thought the papal bull meant victory, he was mistaken. He continued to be "greatly favoured" at Rome,[1] but after a while the king took the matter up and decided to end it. Wishing to show that Heyron had no ground for prosecuting elsewhere than in England, Edward instructed his council to answer the complainant, and a lengthy statement was drawn up by the council on 27th February, 1482.

The arguments which the council brought forward to prove that Heyron should have prosecuted his case in the king's courts instead of abroad need not be rehearsed here. For us the interest of the council's statement lies in two things. In the first place, it contains the assertion that Heyron had insinuated that the merchants of the staple had been circulating the story that the king, while Earl of March, had robbed him, Heyron, of his goods in Calais and afterwards, in order to save himself, had granted Heyron letters patent to prosecute the merchants of the staple in the Parliament of Paris as the supreme court of appeal from Flanders. In the second place, the council declared that the staplers, having been given to understand after the king's last departure from England (i.e., in 1470) that he suspected them of having slandered him and, for that reason, had permitted Heyron to prosecute them in Paris, had sought to clear themselves before the king's council and parliament, that the king, convinced of their innocence and also that Heyron had obtained the license from him to prosecute abroad by misrepresentation and deceit, had written to France to stop the prosecution of the case there, and that when Heyron still persevered in his malicious appeals to other princes and the Pope, parliament had taken action in the matter, both forbidding Heyron to prosecute in a foreign court and ordering him to prosecute in England at a certain time. It should be added that the council also declared that no such license to prosecute the merchants of the staple at Paris as Heyron claimed to have could be found, that if such license existed it must be under the king's signet, and that the royal secretary who had charge of the signet ring at the time, and who was one of the chief promoters of Heyron's purpose with the king, was dead. If Heyron actually possessed letters under the privy seal, it was stated, either those letters must be of a general character or, if they specifically licensed him to prosecute the merchants, they must have been surreptitiously obtained. In any case, the king now formally revoked the letters, if they existed, declared that the case ought to be referred to his courts, and announced that Heyron should have a hearing and justice there.[1] And according to Fabyan, what finally happened was that the staplers "purchased an absolution," while Heyron, "after long being in Westminster as a sanctuary man, without recovery of his costs or duty, died there, being greatly indebted unto many persons."

---

[1] See a letter written by the Prior of St. John's at Rome on 27th October, 1481. Cely Papers, 69.

The somewhat tedious story of Heyron and his lawsuit has been told at length because Fabyan's account of it is a confused one and, in consequence, Fabyan's readers all these years have deemed Edward IV guilty of a great and intentional injustice to a society of merchants to which he, as well as his predecessors, was deeply indebted. Apparently the only real complaint which the merchants of the staple had to make against Edward was that he had licensed Heyron to prosecute them in a foreign country; and that license, as they afterwards learned, Heyron either never possessed or had obtained under false pretenses.

One of the last matters brought up for consideration and adjustment by Edward's first parliament was the controversy between the Bishop of Winchester and the tenants of his manor of East Meon. Waynflete may have feared that he would receive scant justice from a Yorkist king and parliament, but, as it turned out, he had nothing to complain of. The tenants had sent up their representatives as Edward had told them to do when he was at Winchester, and Edward now directed certain persons, including Thomas Lyttleton, one of his sergeants, and Henry Sotill, his attorney, to examine their complaints and make a report to him and the Lords. The tenants put in a plea to be discharged of all "works and customs" demanded of them by the bishop by reason of their tenures, of all "chirchetts" of hens and corn, of the tithing penny claimed twice a year, and of a payment in money called "custom pannage for swine," and asserted that they were freeholders, not copyholders, as all tenures within the lordship were "charter land and free land, and not copy land"; while the bishop, on his part, produced many proofs in support of his right to require these payments. On 14th December Lyttleton and his colleagues brought in their report, and after some discussion the Lords were given until the following morning to deliberate. The next morning the arguments of both parties were presented at length, but in the end a decision was rendered in favour of the bishop on the ground that his claims were upheld by "the old books, evidences, writings, customaries, court-rolls, particular account books called the pipes of the days of fifteen bishops successively one after another," and other records, as well as by possession "of time out of mind," whereas the tenants had shown no sufficient evidence to the contrary. Then, on the following day, when both the king and the judges were present in the House of Lords, the chancellor laid the matter before the king, who confirmed the Lords' decision that the tenants must pay the rents and do the services demanded by the bishop.[1]

---

[1] French Roll, *ut sup.*

The end of the story of Waynflete's troubles with his tenants is worth recording, though it will carry us somewhat afield again. Even after the House of Lords had decided against them, the men of East Meon stuck to their guns, and by the following May some of them were in London again complaining to the king that Waynflete had imprisoned certain of their neighbours. The king told them to go home and to send up to him at Whitsuntide two or three men from every hundred of the lordship, and he also told the bishop to send representatives at the same time with full instructions, so that he and his council would be able to take such action in the matter as would be to "ye pleasure of God and ease, rest, and peace of either party." The bishop obeyed the king's order and so did the tenants, but suddenly, to the king's "great marvelling" and to the bishop's "hurt and tedious vexation," the tenants departed from Leicester, where the king was staying at Whitsuntide, without waiting for a hearing. By their flight the tenants seemed to confess that they were in the wrong, and at a meeting of the king's council held in the Star Chamber on 3rd July, 1462, it was decided that the sheriff of the county of Southampton should be directed to assist Waynflete to maintain his rights and make proclamation in the lordship of East Meon that all the tenants must pay their rents and continue to do the services they had done in the past "as they will eschew the peril that may fall."[2] But if the men of East Meon were quiet after this, Waynflete found himself in trouble elsewhere, for the tenants of another manor, that of Alverstoke, had caught the contagion. The Alverstoke men also wanted to escape from

[1] Rolls of Parl., V, 475-476; Chandler's Life of Waynflete, 111-113, 348-352.
[2] Warrants of the Council, file 1547

paying certain rents and doing certain services required by the bishop, including tallages and "rent of salt," chirchetts of hens and eggs, pannage of hogs, redemption of their children and beasts, suit of hundred without the manor, and certain ground rents; and taking warning from the failure of their neighbours, they were careful to provide themselves with "sufficient matters in writing." But they promised on their faith and truth to pay the hated rents and to do the hated services if the decision of the justices of assize, before whom they brought their suit, proved to be against them; and the decision was against them, as again the bishop was able to produce from the "old muniments" of his bishopric convincing proof of the justice of his demands.[1]

It was not until Christmas drew near that parliament was prorogued. The bill of attainder had consumed much time, and only on 21st December did the Speaker announce the assent of the Commons to it. The bill was delivered to the king in full parliament, and Edward seized the opportunity to thank the Commons, in a simple, straight-forward way which must have pleased his hearers, for the support they had given him. "James Strangways," said the king, "and ye that be comen for the commons of this my land, for the true hearts and tender considerations that ye have had to my right and title that I and my ancestors have had unto the crown of this realm, the which from us have been long time withheld and now, thanked be Almighty God, of Whose grace groweth all victory, by your true hearts and great assistance I am restored unto that that is my right and title, wherefore I thank you as heartily as I can. Also for the tender and true hearts that ye have showed unto me, in that that ye have tenderly had in remembrance the correction of the horrible murder and cruel death of my lord my father, my brother Rutland, and my cousin of Salisbury and other, I thank you right heartily; and I shall be unto you, with the grace of Almighty God, as good and gracious sovereign lord as ever was any of my noble progenitors to their subjects and liegemen. And for the faithful and loving hearts, and also the great labours that ye have borne and sustained towards me in the recovering of my said right and title, which I now possess, I thank you with all my heart, and if I had any better good to reward you withal than my body, ye should have it, the which shall alway be ready for your defence, never sparing nor letting for no jeopardy;

---

[1] Close Roll 4 Edw. IV, m. 26 and 27 dorso.

praying you all of your hearty assistance and good continuance, as I shall be unto you your very rightwise and loving liege lord."[1]

When the king had finished his speech, the chancellor announced that an ordinance to check certain crimes and abuses was to be proclaimed and that the king intended to visit the different parts of his kingdom to enable those who had suffered from those crimes and abuses to lay their grievances before him. This ordinance was directed, first of all, against two long-standing causes of trouble, maintenance and the giving of liveries, which no number of statutes seemed to be able to stamp out, and against the newer vices of dicing and card playing; but it also commanded the king's subjects to make every effort to capture thieves and murderers and warned all who had been pardoned for bearing arms against the king that, if they repeated their offences, they would be punished without remission or favour. The condition of the country called loudly for the strict enforcement of this ordinance, and all the lords attending the parliament had already given their promise to the king in the parliament chamber that they would keep it and that they would further all efforts to capture criminals, even though the criminals were their own retainers.[2]

Immediately after the new ordinance was announced, parliament was prorogued. One legal reform had been established by statute—the criminal jurisdiction of the sheriffs in their tourns had been taken from them and given to the justices of the peace.[3] But aside from that statute the first parliament of Edward IV is memorable only for its recognition of his title to the throne and its attainder of his opponents. It did not even grant the new king the means of paying his debts. To be sure, the confiscation of the duchy of Lancaster, the attainder of the Lancastrians, and the act of resumption would bring a great deal of valuable property into the king's possession, but the outstretched hands waiting for rewards were very many. The patent rolls of the first year of Edward's reign teem with grants made out of the forfeited estates of the Lancastrians.

Probably Edward had not asked the Commons for a grant and so felt it no grievance that one was not made. Yet he had received one warning during the session that, cordially as he had been greeted by his new subjects in parliament, his wishes and theirs

[1] Rolls of Parl., V, 487.
[2] Rolls of Parl., V, 487-488.
[3] Statute 1 Edw. IV, c. 2.

might sometimes clash. The Duke of Burgundy had rendered invaluable services to the house of York and Edward was expecting to build his whole foreign policy on a close alliance with Philip. But Philip was disliked by most Englishmen, in the first place because he had signed the treaty of Arras with Charles VII and in the second place because on more than one occasion he had prohibited the importation of English cloth and yarn into his domains; and this dislike had revealed itself in a petition to the king in parliament "for restraint of certain merchandises to be brought into this land" by the duke's subjects. Such a restriction on Burgundy's trade with England was certain to give great offence to Philip, and yet Edward had not dared to refuse the petition outright. Apparently the most that he had ventured to do was to make his granting of it dependent on Philip's consent.[1]

---

[1] The Rolls of Parliament contain no reference to this petition, but see some instructions which were drawn up for the guidance of Lord Wenlock and others whom Edward planned to send to Burgundy in the following spring. Chancery Diplomatic Documents (Foreign), no. 365 P. A transcript of this document may be found in Rymer's Collectanea, Additional MSS. 4613, no. 59.

CHAPTER V

LANCASTRIAN PLOTS AND OTHER ANXIETIES

As soon as parliament was prorogued, Edward went back to Greenwich to celebrate Christmas and to keep, on New Year's Eve, his father's first "year's mind"; but early in January he set out on a pilgrimage to Canterbury. His prayers at Becket's tomb were interrupted by a report from Sandwich that some of his ships had been carried off by "shipmen," but a hurried visit to the scene convinced him that nothing worse was in prospect, and by 23rd January he was again at Westminster Palace.[1]

England was now growing used to the rule of this handsome, energetic young prince, and yet in spite of all that Edward and his powerful assistant, Warwick, had accomplished in the last ten months, the country was still far from peaceful and orderly. A general pardon was proclaimed, probably in honour of the Christmas festival,[2] but neither that nor the ordinance lately announced in parliament did much to better matters. In January Margaret Paston wrote to her husband that she had never heard of so much robbery and manslaughter "as is now within a little time."[3] In Derbyshire, Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westmoreland, it was reported, a rebellion was being fomented, and even in the southern counties there were suspicious gatherings of people during the winter. Not only Margaret of Anjou, but the Duke of Brittany, and even the new king of France—so little was Louis XI trusted by his friends—were suspected of having a hand in these disturbances, and watches were set on the sea-coast, and the master of the king's ordnance was again ordered to have ready bombards, cannon, bows, arrows, saltpetre, and other requisites of war.[4] Very soon a report was going about that a spy had been captured who had confessed that a plot of vast dimensions was on foot. The

---

[1] Privy Seals; Chron. of John Stone, 84-85; Flenley's Six Town Chron., 163.

[2] Paston Letters, IV, 26.

[3] *Ibid.*, IV, 25.

[4] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 101, 102, 114-115, 132.

Duke of Exeter and the Earl of Pembroke, this spy said, were about to land in North Wales, at Beaumaris, while Queen Margaret's brother, John of Calabria, the Duke of Somerset, Lord Hungerford, Doctor John Morton, and sixty thousand Spaniards were to land in Norfolk and Suffolk, and an army of Frenchmen and Spaniards, led by Sir John Fortescue and others, at Sandwich; and when these landings had been effected, according to the story, the kings of France, Denmark, Aragon, and Portugal, and Queen Margaret's father were to descend upon England with two hundred and twenty-five thousand men! Even the Duke of Burgundy—though probably the Count of Charolais was the person really meant—was said to be in this great league with Margaret.[1]

This story was certainly a preposterous exaggeration, but there does seem to have been some reason in the early weeks of 1462 to suspect the existence of a plot of considerable magnitude; and on 12th February, while commissions of *oyer* and *terminer* touching trespasses and treasons were being dispatched to no less than twenty-five of the counties of England and to eight of the chief cities and towns,[2] the Earl of Oxford, Aubrey de Vere, his eldest son, Sir Thomas Tudenham, formerly keeper of the great wardrobe and treasurer of the household to Henry VI,[3] and three other men, John Clopton, John Montgomery, and William Tyrrel, were arrested in Essex and brought to the Tower. So suddenly were these arrests made that the Earl of Oxford's name appeared on a commission of peace for Norfolk which was issued on the very day he was taken into custody.[4]

Accounts differ somewhat as to just what Oxford and his confederates had been guilty of, and also as to how their guilt was discovered. According to one story, they had sent word to Henry and Margaret that when Edward went north with his army, they would offer to go with him and then would seize the first opportunity to murder him and all his followers; but their messenger became so conscience-stricken, while he was attending mass in a church somewhere near Northampton, that he took their letters to King Edward, who copied them, and then gave them back to him with orders to carry them to Henry and bring back Henry's reply.[1] According to another and probably more reliable story, Margaret and Oxford had been making arrangements for the Duke of Somerset, who was still in Bruges and probably secretly supported in everything he did by the Count of Charolais, to land with an army on the coast of Essex. One contemporary chronicler states that it was Oxford's own son, Aubrey de Vere, who revealed the earl's conspiracy to the king,[2] but while that may be true, it is evident from a letter sent to Paston from Norfolk that news of the plot leaked out through more than one channel. The writer had heard "in right secret wise," he said, that Henry and Margaret and the Duke of Somerset had an army of a hundred and twenty thousand men ready to land in England about Candlemas Day and that one part of this army was to proceed from the Trent towards London, another part was to advance from Wales, and the third part from Jersey and Guernsey. He advised Paston to make this known to the Earl of Warwick so that the earl would see that the king took the necessary precautions; and he showed his anxiety by remarking that, while he did not doubt that the trouble would be overcome "if we were all one," there were many "meddlers" and they were "best cherished, which would hurt much if these come to, as God defend."[3]

---

[1] Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 158. The writer of this chronicle displays gross ignorance. For instance, he speaks of *Edward*, Duke of Burgundy, *Harry*, the Dauphin of France, and Duke *Harry* of Calabria.

[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 132.

[3] Privy Council Proceedings, VI, 100; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 464; Receipt Roll, Mich. 38 Hen. VI. After the battle of Northampton Tudenham succeeded in obtaining from the Yorkists what was then owing to him for the expenses of the wardrobe, to wit, £491 3*s.* 4*d.*, but a commission for his arrest was issued a few weeks after Edward took the throne. Close Roll 39 Hen. VI, m. 5; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 28. Cf. Paston Letters, III, 278.

[4] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 568.

Whatever plan the conspirators had in mind and in whatever way it was discovered, "high and mighty treason that they imagined against the king" was the crime of which all of the accused, with the exception of John Clopton, were hastily convicted in the court of the constable of England; and the Earl of Worcester, who had been appointed constable only a few days before their arrest and given the power, not belonging to that office hitherto, of hearing and determining cases of high treason, was accused of displaying his learning by judging the prisoners by the law of Padua.[4] If Aubrey de Vere had actually betrayed his own father, his shameful act failed to save his head. In fact, he was the first to die. On

---

[1] Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 162-163; Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 106-107. Cf. Waurin, II, 299-300.

[2] Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 175; Hearne's Fragment, 289.

[3] Paston Letters, IV, 32-33.

[4] Stubbs, III, 289; Warkworth, 5. Cf. Vespasiano da Bisticci, Vite di Uomini Illustri del Secolo XV, I, 325.

20th February he was drawn from Westminster to Tower Hill and there beheaded on a new scaffold eight feet high. Three days later Tudenham, Tyrrel, and Montgomery underwent a like punishment, and on the 26th the Earl of Oxford himself was led on foot from Westminster to Tower Hill to die on the scaffold on which his son's blood was scarcely dry. After the executions the bodies of the conspirators were given Christian burial in the church of the Augustine Friars, but their heads probably found a place on London bridge.[1]

The men brought to trial before the Earl of Worcester were not the only persons who fell under suspicion. Apparently the Countess of Oxford, Elizabeth Howard, was thought to have had some share in the treason of her husband and son; for she seems to have been kept under surveillance, if not actually in custody, until the end of May, when, in consideration of her "humble, good, and faithful disposition" and of her age and infirmity of body, she was set at liberty, declared to be the king's true subject and faithful liege, and granted the right to hold and enjoy all lands and tenements which had come to her by inheritance, gift, or purchase.[2] The abbot and monks of Bury St. Edmund's were also placed under arrest about the time Oxford was taken to the Tower, and though they soon obtained a general pardon, the abbot had to pay a fine of five hundred marks. To judge from a letter which Antonio della Torre wrote to Coppini, the monks' offence had been the posting over their church door of a notice stating that the Pope had revoked all that Coppini had done in England, had given plenary absolution to all adherents of Henry VI, and had excommunicated all Edward's adherents.[3]

Less fortunate than the monks of Bury was Sir William Legh of Isell, Cumberland. Sir William had been granted a general pardon on 5th February, but very soon after a hundred pounds was offered for his capture and by the end of the month Robert

---

[1] Fabyan, 652; Kingsford's London Chron., 177; Flenley's Six Town Chron., 163; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 78; Worcester, 779; Gregory, 218; Warkworth, *ut sup.* (where a mistake is made in regard to the year in which these events occurred). Cf. Dugdale, I, 197, who cites the inquisition taken after Oxford's death, and Stow, Survey of London, I, 178. Waurin gives a most gruesome account of the earl's execution, but fortunately it may be cast aside as fiction.

[2] Writs of Privy Seal, file 791, no. 957. Cf. Scofield, Eng. Hist. Review, April, 1914, p. 22.

[3] Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 162; Pardon Roll 1-6 Edw. IV, m. 47, 8th and 28th Feb.; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 178; Receipt Roll, Easter 2 Edw. IV; Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 107.

Skelton of Carlisle had won the money.[1] On the first day of March three more men were led from Westminster to Tower Hill to suffer death on the scaffold which had been erected for the execution of the Essex conspirators, and Sir William Legh was probably one of them.[2]

It is not unlikely that Oxford and those who were executed with him had really been guilty of plotting for the restoration of Henry VI. Yet there were not many persons, evidently, who believed in their guilt, as one writer of the time declares that most of the people were sorry for their death. Edward had been genuinely alarmed, however, and as usual he turned to Warwick for help. If a great invasion of England had been planned, every precaution must be taken to prevent a hostile army from getting across the sea, and the day after Oxford's arrest Warwick had been retained by the king to keep the sea for three years and promised a thousand pounds a year for the purpose.[3] A few days later the earl paid a visit to Kent in the capacity of warden of the Cinque Ports, and from Kent he seems to have crossed over to Calais to make sure that all was safe there and to pay over to Sir Walter Blount the two thousand pounds the king had obtained from Simon Nori and Angelo Tany.[4]

An additional cause for anxiety at this moment was the dangerous illness of Philip of Burgundy. The duke had indulged in too many banquets at the time of Louis' coronation, and early in the new year he lay so close to death's door that his physicians gave him up.[5] A greater disaster than Philip's death could hardly befall Edward at the opening of his reign, both because the duke's son and heir, the Count of Charolais, was almost sure to give his friendship and support to Henry and Margaret, and because it was through Philip that Edward was hoping to secure a treaty with Louis which would effectually prevent Margaret from obtaining aid from France. When some merchants coming over from Bruges brought word of Philip's illness, Edward immediately ordered all his subjects

[1] Pardon Roll, *ut sup.;* Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 28th Feb. Cf. Issue Roll, Mich. 2 Edw. IV, 27th Oct.

[2] Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 78.

[3] Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 26th Feb.; Issue Roll, Mich. 1 Edw. IV, 22nd Feb.; Issue Roll, Easter 2 Edw. IV, 30th June. Cf. Rymer, XI, 488, and Signed Bills, file 1490, no. 3787.

[4] Chron. of John Stone, 85; Issue Roll, Mich. 1 Edw. IV, 17th March; Chancery Miscellaneous Rolls, bundle 20, no. 12.

[5] Commynes-Lenglet, II, 175; Chastellain, IV, 207. Philip's illness began in January or February and lasted till the beginning of July.

to pray for the duke's health, and he himself took part in processions and other religious exercises in London which, it was hoped, would hasten the duke's recovery.[1] Fortunately the prayers of England were answered; Philip did not die. But the duke's convalescence was slow and he never fully regained his former strength and energy.

The need of Philip's friendship and good offices was the more keenly felt because the fear that Louis' feeling towards the house of York was undergoing a change was growing stronger every day. During the early months of 1462 Louis was busying himself with the affairs of his neighbours across the Pyrenees, and as his relations with England at this moment were determined in part by his Spanish policy, and as owing to Louis' effort to mould events in Aragon and Navarre Edward was drawn into Spanish politics, a little attention must be given to the situation south of the Pyrenees.

Alphonso V of Aragon lived at Naples after his conquest of that kingdom and left his brother John to act as his lieutenant in Aragon. John had married Blanche of Navarre, daughter and heiress of Charles III of Navarre, and of this marriage three children had been born, Carlos, Prince of Viana, Blanche, who married, but later was divorced from, the Prince of the Asturias, afterwards Henry IV (the Impotent) of Castile, and Eleanor, who married the powerful Count of Foix, Gaston IV. Upon the death of Charles III in 1425, his daughter and her husband were recognized as joint sovereigns of Navarre, but when, in 1441, Blanche of Navarre died, she left a will which soon brought on civil war. For while the queen provided that her son, the Prince of Viana, should be proclaimed king of Navarre and that the crown should pass in case of his death first to his sister Blanche and after her to his sister Eleanor, she also requested her son not to assume control of the kingdom without first securing the consent of his father. Don Carlos, consequently, did not at once press his claim against his father, who showed no inclination to resign the kingship, and it was not until John married again and was the father of another son, Ferdinand, afterwards king of Aragon and husband of Isabella of Castile, that trouble began.

In the struggle which ensued Blanche took sides with her brother, while John sought the aid of his son-in-law, the Count of Foix, and, in order to secure that aid, disinherited—though he had no real power to do so—Carlos and Blanche and declared the Countess of Foix heiress of Navarre. Unsuccessful in his efforts to obtain his birth-right, Don Carlos, who was a man of letters rather than a warrior, at length fled to his uncle Alphonso at Naples. But in 1458 Alphonso died, leaving his conquered kingdom of Naples to his illegitimate son, another Ferdinand, and his hereditary domains, Aragon and Sicily, to his brother John, with the result that John, who was already by usurpation king of Navarre, now found himself king of Aragon and Sicily as well. About two years after the death of Alphonso, Don Carlos returned to Spain and a reconciliation between him and his father was effected; but as far as John was concerned the reconciliation was a mere sham, and in December, 1460, he caused Don Carlos to be arrested and imprisoned.

---

[1] Chastellain, *ut sup.*

After the arrest of Don Carlos the situation became serious. In Catalonia, the most independent and also the richest province in John's kingdom, Don Carlos was held in warm affection, not only on account of his personal qualities, but also because, according to the ancient constitutions of which the Catalonians boasted, he was, as heir presumptive to the crown of Aragon, lieutenant-general of their province; and on his behalf, consequently, the Catalonians now rose in rebellion. John checked the torrent for a moment by releasing his son, but unfortunately Don Carlos then determined to make another attempt to assert his claim to Navarre, and as John was in league with Charles VII of France, Don Carlos naturally sought an alliance with Charles's rebellious son, the Dauphin Louis. The alliance between Don Carlos and Louis was not yet fully arranged when Charles VII died and Louis ascended the throne of France. Nor had it yet been concluded when, in September, 1461, Don Carlos himself died and, bequeathing the crown of Navarre, which he had never actually worn, to his sister Blanche, by right the next in order of succession, recommended her cause to Louis. After the death of Don Carlos, Louis, who was really feeling his way towards an assertion of certain feudal rights over Aragon and Catalonia, discreetly negotiated with all parties, but John, pressed by the hostility of Henry the Impotent, with whom Don Carlos had intrigued, and fearing, with reason, that Louis was inclined to take up the cause of Blanche and the Catalonians, determined to seek an alliance with England, whose wool trade with Barcelona gave her an interest in all that befell the kingdom of Aragon and whose traditional hatred of France would probably induce her to give aid in case Louis actually did take sides with the Catalonians.[1]

John of Aragon's negotiations with Edward IV were carried on through one Vincent Clement, doctor of theology, who was an Aragonese or Catalonian by birth but an Englishman by adoption, as he had been educated at Oxford, had served Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, at Rome when the duke was trying to get the Pope to sanction the divorce of Jacqueline of Hainault from her former husband, had afterwards been employed by Henry VI on several extended diplomatic missions to France and the Pope, and during the last years of Henry's reign had been both papal collector in England and king's proctor at the court of Rome.[2] Though there was sufficient excuse for Clement's presence in England, a rumour that he was acting as John of Aragon's agent was not long in reaching Louis' ears. This disturbed the French king, and as he was also displeased by the response the Catalonians had made to his overtures, he abruptly changed his plans and, abandoning Blanche and the Catalonians, entered into an alliance with the Count of Foix, the husband of Blanche's sister and rival, as a first step towards forming an alliance with the king of Aragon himself.[3] As a further step towards the same end, Louis also started out to make John see that his interests would be much better served by the friendship of a close neighbour like the king of France than by that of the king of England; and he thought he could best accomplish his purpose by securing from Edward and Warwick a show of good will towards himself which would make John feel that any promises of help Edward had given him were valueless. This was why a French embassy was soon on its way to England.

But Louis was careful to disguise the real object of his embassy to Edward, and this he could easily do, as he had good excuses for negotiating with the king of England which had nothing to do with the king of Aragon. For one thing, after the plea which had been made by the Bishop of Arras, it was fitting that the king of France should interest himself in the general pacification of Europe which was essential to the success of the Pope's crusade; and although some other French ambassadors were at this very moment trying to enlist the sympathy of Henry the Impotent on behalf of Henry VI,[1] Louis let it be understood that his purpose in sending an embassy to England was to persuade Edward and Henry to cease from quarrelling and serve God by fighting the infidels.[2] Louis found another excuse for his embassy, however, of which also he made good use. After Wenlock, Clay, and the Dean of St. Severin's promised Philip of Burgundy at Valenciennes that other English ambassadors should cross the sea to negotiate with him and with Louis, Edward seems to have talked of sending Warwick himself to Burgundy;[3] but because of Philip's illness, and perhaps also because of the growing distrust of Louis felt in England, no embassy whatever had yet been sent. Louis might well wish to make inquiries about Edward's intentions, therefore, and knowing how much Philip desired a truce between England and France, he seems to have succeeded in inducing the duke to make the embassy to England a joint one.[4] This was a very clever move on Louis' part, and he was also clever enough to put at the head of his embassy the Seigneur de la Barde, the man who had represented him at the battle of Towton.

---

[1] On all the events mentioned above, see Calmette, Louis XI, Jean II, et la révolution Catalane.

[2] Rymer, XI, 359, 379; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 195, 644; Foreign Roll 28 Hen. VI, no. 84; Official Correspondence of Thomas Bekynton (Rolls Series), I, lxxiii-lxxv, 172-179, etc.; Vickers, Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, 323; Calmette, 60, note 3. In a general pardon which Edward granted to Clement on 17th March, 1464, he is described as professor of theology, subdeacon of the Pope, collector-general in England, and nuncio of the Apostolic See. Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 322.

[3] Louis' alliance with Gaston de Foix was cemented by the marriage of his sister Madeleine, once sought by the Duke of York as a bride for Edward, and Gaston's son. The marriage took place at Bordeaux on 7th March. Calmette, 65; Legeay, I, 300.

Louis' ambassadors reached England about the end of February, when the excitement caused by the discovery of the Earl of Oxford's conspiracy was still at its height, and they were cordially welcomed, as Edward's fear that Philip was about to die, and also the wild rumours concerning Margaret's intrigues, made him doubly eager for some assurance that Louis was still his friend. Plans for the embassy agreed on at Valenciennes were at once resumed, and Thomas Vaughan, so recently released from captivity in France, was immediately sent to Louis, apparently to make some preliminary arrangements.[5] Lord Wenlock and other important personages, who were probably to be selected after Vaughan had consulted Louis, were to follow later to Calais, whither it was hoped the French king and the Duke of Burgundy would send ambassadors to meet them ;[1] and instructions for Wenlock and his colleagues were drawn up on 6th March.

---

[1] Lettres de Louis XI, II, 379.

[2] Chastellain, IV, 220-221.

[3] Mandrot, Dépêches des ambassadeurs milanais, I, 197.

[4] The "lieutenant of Burgundy" was a member of the embassy. Davies, Extracts from the Municipal Records of the City of York, 5.

[5] Louis granted a safeconduct for Vaughan and a suite of thirty persons on 31st March. Legrand's collections, MS. français 6969, f. 50. Legrand says in his manuscript history that, notwithstanding this safeconduct, Vaughan did not go to France in this year, but this seems to be a mistake,

Edward's instructions for his ambassadors show how carefully he had to feel his way, for his first order was that they should " keep them under generalities" and try by every means to lead the other party " first to break and open their intent." Yet he was careful not to appear too eager, and also not to let Louis think that he had forgotten England's claims in France. In case the Duke of Burgundy's commissioners expressed a wish for a " general intercourse of merchandise" between England and Burgundy, the English ambassadors were to reply that that could not well be arranged without a truce ; and if their suggestion of a truce seemed to meet with favour, they were to declare " in the most solemn wise that they can " that, many years before there was any question regarding the title to the crown of France, the kings of England possessed by lawful inheritance the duchies of Normandy and Guienne and the counties of Anjou and Maine, and to say that, if a promise was given that those duchies and counties would be restored to the king of England, they would agree to a three years' truce. They were also to intimate that, if the king of France would refrain from including the king of Scotland and his subjects in the truce and from assisting the Scots against the king of England, ways and means might be found for the establishment of a final and perpetual peace between England and France, with the result that the shedding of Christian blood would be avoided and both parties would be better able to help the Pope to defend the Faith and repress the Turks. But if those who represented the French king would not agree to the proviso, " nor, at the least, to the restitution of the duchy of Guienne," Wenlock and his colleagues, " rather than break," were to agree to the truce without the restitution of the said duchies and counties. On the other hand, if the Duke of Burgundy's commissioners approached them on the subject of a " particular intercourse " between England and Burgundy, they were to make sure, first of all, that the duke had been licensed by

---

as he received fifty pounds from Edward for his services Issue Roll, Mich. 1 Edw. IV, 7th Nov.

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 107-108.

the French king, of whom he "calleth himself subject," to enter into such a treaty with another country, and then, if the duke had such a license, they were to treat with him for two things: first, for a three years' intercourse of merchandise which was to be like the one formerly in force, "except the changing of the styles," and in which the duke's license from Louis to make the treaty was to be incorporated; and second, for a new three years' truce of the best terms they could make or, "rather than break," for a renewal of the old truce. Edward cautioned his ambassadors, however, not to conclude the intercourse of merchandise without the truce, or the truce without the intercourse of merchandise; and his final order to them was that they were to take with them a copy of the petition which had been made to him in parliament "for restraint of certain merchandises to be brought into this land by the said duke's subjects and other," and also a copy of his reply, and try to secure Philip's consent "so that the said petition may take effect."[1]

The Seigneur de la Barde stayed in England long enough to pay a visit to the scenes of his former exploits as a member of Edward's army and to meet the Earl of Warwick in the hospitable city of York;[2] and in the meantime Edward and Warwick wrote letters to Louis—as did also Louis Galet, who had just spent so long a time at the French court and whom one of Louis' confidants described as "ce notable trompeur."[3] These letters, with others from the Seigneur de la Barde himself, were sent to France by the hands of Warwick Herald and a son of Galet,[4] and they reached Louis, who by that time had betaken himself to the south of France to further his intrigues, at Bordeaux about the first of April. But before they came, Louis' fears had been increased. In the first place, he had recently had a narrow escape from being carried off by some English pirates,[5] an experience which was not calculated to calm his nerves; and in the second place, a servant of the Earl of Kendal who had just returned from England had brought very alarming reports of what was going on between the courts of England and Aragon. Edward and Warwick, this man said, had promised John of Aragon that Warwick should go to sea with a fleet as soon as he had made things secure in the north of England, and as Louis gathered that the assistance to be given to John was to take the shape of an attack on the coast of France, he was not quite sure that he ought to put faith in any letters from Edward and Warwick. And yet the letters sounded reassuring. In fact, they were of such a tone and import that Louis made haste to send them to Gaston de Foix with directions to lay them before the king of Aragon, who would be convinced, he hoped, by their humbleness and their references to the English embassy to be sent to France that Edward and Warwick were merely playing with him and that it was folly for him to count on aid from them. But Louis warned Gaston not to let John amuse him with words until Warwick put to sea, which he was likely to do by the first of May.[1]

---

[1] Chancery Diplomatic Documents (Foreign), no. 365 P. (See Appendix V.).

[2] Davies, York Records, 2-7. To judge from the provisions supplied for these guests, the city must have given a banquet in their honour.

[3] Commynes-Dupont, III, 200.

[4] Warwick Herald received ten pounds for his journey to France. Issue Roll, Mich. 1 Edw. IV, 30th Oct. Two sons of Louis Galet "de Calais," Edmund and William, are mentioned in Issue Roll, Mich. 2 Edw. IV, 23rd March. Edmund had been an agent of the Duke of Alençon during the duke's treasonable negotiations with the English. Chartier, III, 101 *et seq.* There seems to have been a Simon Galet as well. Beaucourt, VI, 289.

[5] Chastellain, IV, 197-198.

If Louis continued to fear Edward and Warwick in spite of their letters, so did they continue to fear him in spite of the embassy he had sent to them; and their fear must have been considerably increased if Warwick Herald and Galet's son reported, as they probably did, that an envoy from Queen Margaret, Sir Edmund Hampden, was also being entertained by Louis at Bordeaux.[2] It looked a little suspicious, too, that about this time the ambassadors Margaret had sent to France at the moment of Charles VII's death succeeded in returning to Scotland. Early in March the Duke of Somerset got away from Flanders and across the sea in a Scottish carvel,[3] and he was soon followed by Lord Hungerford from Dieppe. A few days after Hungerford slid past the English coast a French boat was taken off the Norfolk coast, near Sherringham, and the master and crew made a confession which renewed the fear that Philip of Burgundy was going to die and that Margaret had succeeded in forming a great European league. These men are said to have stated that Somerset had gone to Scotland, that

---

[1] See a very interesting letter from Louis to the Count of Foix, Lettres de Louis XI, II, 37-39, and two letters from Charles de Melun which Mlle. Dupont has ascribed to the year 1463 but which undoubtedly belong to 1462, Commynes-Dupont, III, 199-205. On the whole subject of Louis' relations with John of Aragon, see again Calmette, Louis XI, Jean II et la révolution Catalane.

[2] Legrand's history, MS. français 6960, f. 436.

[3] Worcester, 779.

Hungerford had passed Sherringham the Monday before on his way to Scotland in a carvel of Dieppe, that the Duke of Burgundy was "poisoned and not like to recover," that two hundred Spanish and three hundred Breton ships were going to assemble in the Seine to strengthen the French navy, and that the king of France had gone to Spain on a pilgrimage "with few horse," though for what purpose they were not sure.[1]

If not more than half of the statements made in this confession were true, there was still enough reason for alarm, and the opening sentences of a letter which Edward wrote on 13th March to Thomas Cook, one of the aldermen of London, shows how quickly his fears had been reawakened, and also how many stories were still afloat about what Margaret was trying to do. The king, writing to give Cook instructions about raising money for him in London, told the alderman that he had received information that King Henry, by Margaret's advice, had entered into a conspiracy with his enemies in France and Scotland and other countries. These enemies, he said, were soon to land in England in great numbers to make such "war, depopulation, robbery, and manslaughter as here before hath not been used among Christian people." By all ways and means in their power, he declared, they would "destroy utterly the people, the name, the tongue, and all the blood English of this our said realm." Henry had even been moved, Edward asserted, by "the malicious and subtle suggestion and enticing of the said malicious woman, Margaret, his wife," to promise that if their enterprise was successful, Margaret's uncle, Charles of Anjou,[2] and the French should rule over England; and he had sent to "Louis de Valois, naming himself king of France," a renunciation and release of the right and title which England had to the realm and crown of France and to the duchies and counties which belonged to her. Nor was that all of which Henry was accused, for Edward declared that he had also granted to the Scots not only the town and castle of Berwick, which had already been handed over to them, but a great part of the realm of England.[3]

The new fright about a French invasion led to the usual commission to Geoffrey Gate and the Abbot of Quarre to prepare for the defence of the Isle of Wight,[1] and plans for the naval expedition under Warwick's command which had so alarmed Louis were hastily matured. On 20th March Warwick's powers as keeper of the sea were extended to include that of treating for the surrender of territory belonging to the king's enemies, which suggests that large undertakings were being planned and that Louis' fears had been well founded.[2]

---

[1] Paston Letters, IV, 35.

[2] Charles, Count of Maine, brother of René of Anjou.

[3] Ellis, Original Letters, Series II, Vol. I, 126; Halliwell, Letters of the Kings of England, I, 126.

But in spite of all this mutual suspicion, Louis had very promptly granted safeconducts for the embassy Edward had proposed to send to him and Philip, though he did not dispatch them directly to Calais for transmission to England as he would have done under ordinary circumstances. When passing through Paris on his way to Bordeaux, Warwick Herald had talked rather indiscreetly about how the Count of Charolais was feared in England and about Edward's dread of Philip's death, and Louis, who at this moment was courting Charolais' good will, not only saw to it that the English herald's imprudent remarks reached Charles's ears, but left it to the count to decide whether the safeconducts for Edward's embassy should be sent to Calais or withheld.[3] Charles probably decided against sending them, and no doubt this was what Louis wanted him to do. For although Louis had no thought of invading England, he also had no wish to commit himself to a truce with Edward unless it was absolutely necessary, and it was not necessary now, as the Seigneur de la Barde's journey to London had accomplished its true purpose. John of Aragon had been brought to his senses and had turned his face away from England. A league was signed between Louis and John on 12th April and confirmed at a personal interview early in May. Navarre was to remain in John's possession with the understanding that at his death it was to pass to the Countess of Foix, and Louis undertook, according to a bargain which ultimately enabled him to get possession of the counties of Roussillon and Cerdagne, to aid John in putting down the rebellion in Catalonia.

Several weeks before England heard anything about the agreement between Louis and John of Aragon, Warwick, accompanied by the Bishop of Durham and the Earl of Kent, had gone back to the north to complete the work that must be done there before he

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 203.

[2] Rymer, XI, 488; Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 106.

[3] See one of the letters from Charles de Melun referred to above, Commynes-Dupont, III, 201-202.

could take command of the fleet and go to John's help, if such was the plan.[1] Although conditions in the north were still bad, there was hope of speedy improvement; for though no truce had yet been obtained from the Scots, the plan to incite the Earl of Ross to rebel promised to succeed, and when Ross began to make trouble for James III, the truce would probably follow quickly.

The negotiations with Ross and Ballagh had consumed a good deal of time and the arguments of the Earl of Douglas had to be backed up by a gift of a hundred marks to Ross and one of fifty pounds to Ballagh and his son;[2] but the result was highly satisfactory. Reynold of the Isles and Duncan, Archdeacon of the Isles, bearing a commission from Ross which dated back to 19th October, 1461, reached London under the personal guidance of Douglas about the beginning of February,[3] and by the 13th a treaty had been drawn up. In this treaty, which Edward ratified on 17th March, it was agreed that, at Whitsuntide, Ross, Ballagh, and John of the Isles, together with all the inhabitants of the earldom of Ross and the Isles, should become subjects of the kings of England for all time, and that they should always be ready, on reasonable warning, to serve the king of England in all wars which he might wage in Scotland or Ireland. In return Edward promised, first, that he would give Ross one hundred marks a year in time of peace and two hundred pounds a year in time of war, Ballagh twenty pounds a year in time of peace and forty pounds a year in time of war, and John of the Isles ten pounds a year in time of peace and twenty pounds a year in time of war; second, that if he or his successors conquered Scotland or the greater part of it by the help of Ross, Ballagh, and the Earl of Douglas, all possessions of that realm beyond the Scottish Sea should be equally divided among the three, who were to do homage and fealty for them to the kings of England for ever more; and third, that Douglas should have and hold in the same manner all lands south of the Scottish Sea which had formerly belonged to him. Finally, Edward promised to include Ross, Ballagh, and John of the Isles in any truce he might make with the king of Scotland, unless Ross sent word before Whitsuntide that he did not wish to be so included.[1]

---

[1] Warwick went down to Sandwich on 22nd February to look after the fleet, but shortly after he returned to London, and on 5th March he set out after the king, who had started on a progress through his kingdom. Cal. Milanese Papers, *ut sup.* He was soon at York, and his wife remained there while he went on to Carlisle. Davies, York Records, 2-4; MSS. of Corporation of Beverley, 140-141. The earl went back to the north with a more definite understanding as to his powers and responsibilities. See Scofield, Eng. Hist. Review, Jan., 1921, p. 67.

[2] Issue Roll, Mich. 1 Edw. IV, 25th Feb.; Chancery Miscellaneous Rolls, bundle 20, no. 12.

[3] Douglas received £15 5*s.* 5*d.* for conducting the ambassadors to the king, and the ambassadors themselves were given £43 10*s.* for their expenses. Issue Roll and Chancery Misc. Roll, *ut sup.* The Bishop of Durham, the Earl of Worcester, the Prior of St. John's, Lord Wenlock, and the keeper of the privy seal were the men named by Edward to treat with the ambassadors. Rymer, XI, 483.

The day after this treaty was signed, Douglas was rewarded for his efforts in the matter by a grant of an annuity of five hundred pounds, the amount he had formerly received from Henry VI, and two days later an annuity of one hundred pounds was bestowed on his brother John.[2]

A short time before Warwick went north, Edward left London for one of those tours through his kingdom to quell disorders and mete out justice which had been promised at the close of the parliament. But he took with him the master of his ordnance and certain "habiliments of war," and he was evidently planning to teach a lesson to the Scots if they did not cease to befriend Henry and Margaret and sign a truce with him.[3] For in his letter to Thomas Cook, and in other letters, sent out at the same time,[4] asking for money, he announced that he intended to resist the malicious purposes of King Henry and the "outward enemies" in league with him with all his might and power, that he would spare neither his person nor his goods in defending his kingdom and his subjects, and that if his subjects would "do their part and apply them benevolently to our desire," they would have cause within a few days to think that they had never "better bestowed, beset, or spended any money." Nevertheless, the king did not go farther north than Lincoln. From there he went to Leicester, and at Leicester he remained until the end of the first week of July,[5] although in the meantime the day set for the reconvening of parliament came and went. When the members reassembled at Westminster on 6th May, the Archbishop of Canterbury informed them that it was the will of the absent king that the parliament should be dissolved. Lords and Commons received the thanks of the king by the mouth of the chancellor, and on 27th May the treasurer and chamberlains of the Exchequer were bidden to pay Speaker Strangways two hundred marks in consideration of his "good, true, faithful, and diligent service done unto us in our last parliament."[1]

---

[1] Rymer, XI, 484-487.

[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 105, 106. Cf. Rymer, XI, 487-488.

[3] See Scofield, Eng. Hist. Review, Jan., 1908, pp. 85-87, and Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 106.

[4] Compare with the letter to Cook one which was sent on the same day to the Prior of Worcester Cathedral. Hist. MSS. Com., Report 14, app. 8, p. 179. See also Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 175. To judge from the Receipt Rolls, little or none of the money sent to the king in response to these letters passed through the Exchequer of Receipt.

[5] Privy Seals. Clarence joined the king at Leicester. Issue Roll, Easter 2 Edw. IV, 18th May.

Probably Edward decided, when the time came, that it was unnecessary for him to go to the northern border, as soon after Warwick reached Carlisle it was learned that Margaret of Anjou had left Scotland. Margaret, like Edward, had been making bargains with noble Scots. In Henry's name she had recently promised the Earl of Angus that, if he would assist her husband to recover his kingdom, he should receive as his reward lands between the Trent and the Humber worth two thousand marks a year and that these lands should be erected into a duchy for him and his heirs.[2] But aside from this agreement with Angus, Margaret had accomplished nothing in Scotland of late, and she had been growing more and more convinced that if Henry ever recovered his throne, it would have to be by the help, open and avowed, of the king of France. Even after she had surrendered Berwick to them, the Scots had given her only half-hearted support, and now there was too good reason to fear that Edward and Warwick would rob her even of that unless Louis XI frankly championed the house of Lancaster. No doubt Somerset and Hungerford had done their best under the strange circumstances in which they found themselves after their arrival in France, but Margaret decided that hereafter she would do her own negotiating with France; and after persuading Mary of Gueldres, who was probably only too glad to get rid of so importunate a guest for a while, to loan her two hundred and ninety pounds, she sailed from Kirkcudbright for France soon after 10th April.[3] She took the Prince of Wales with her, but Henry stayed behind at Edinburgh, attended by Sir John Fortescue, whom he had made his chancellor.[1]

---

[1] Rolls of Parl., V, 488; Writs of Privy Seal, file 791, no. 919 (the king's authority to the archbishop to dissolve parliament); Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 194; Warrants for Issues, 2 Edw. IV, 27th May.

[2] Hume of Godscroft, Houses of Douglas and Angus, 215.

[3] Exchequer Rolls of Scotland, VII, 80; Worcester, 779; Lesley, 35. Margaret's commission from Henry to treat with Louis was dated Edinburgh, 10th April. Commynes-Lenglet, II, 368. Evidently, therefore, she did not leave Scotland until after that date.

No sooner was Margaret out of the way than Mary of Gueldres, who was still at heart averse to the alliance with Henry and Margaret into which she had been driven by the desire to get possession of Berwick and by the strong will of the Bishop of St. Andrews, took her son and went to meet Warwick and an English embassy at Dumfries. At the interview between the earl and the queen-mother there was talk not simply of a truce between England and Scotland, but even of a close alliance. This alliance was to be sealed by nothing less than a marriage between Edward IV and Mary of Gueldres, according to the report soon circulating in England, while Louis XI heard a few weeks later that not only was Edward to marry Mary of Gueldres, but James III was to marry Edward's sister, and Edward's brother James's sister![2] Mary of Gueldres was many years Edward's senior and her character was by no means above question, but perhaps those facts did not trouble Warwick. Luckily for Henry and Margaret, however, if not luckily for Edward also, Mary of Gueldres was not ready to make a decision on the spot and the Bishop of St. Andrews set up stout opposition. The bishop flatly refused to go to meet the English envoys himself, as they insisted he must do, and in consequence the negotiations were dropped.[3] Later the queen-mother rode to Coldingham for another interview with some more envoys from England, but again Kennedy's opposition brought the negotiations to naught.[4]

When his attempt to negotiate with Mary of Gueldres failed, Warwick began to make raids into Scotland, and he soon captured one of the border castles.[5] This was an argument which the Scots could not fail to appreciate, and it had the more weight because by this time the Earl of Ross was laying waste the whole of Athol.[6] Not until more than a decade later did James III discover that

---

[1] See the letter of credence given by Henry to Fortescue on 27th March. Waurin, III, 169, note. Probably it was intended at first that Fortescue should accompany Margaret to France.

[2] See Worcester, *ut sup.*, and a letter written to Louis from Boulogne on 11th August, Legrand collections, MS. français 6969, f. 59. Cf. Exchequer Rolls of Scotland, VII, xli, 63. The continuator of the Croyland chronicle declares that Warwick did his best to bring about a marriage between Edward and Mary of Gueldres. Hist. Croy. Cont., 551.

[3] Waurin, III, 167.

[4] *Ibid.*; Exchequer Rolls of Scotland, VII, 152.

[5] Paston Letters, IV, 44. This was probably the good news which Warwick sent to the city of York in May. Davies, York Records, 10.

[6] Lesley, 34.

Edward and Warwick had instigated Ross's raid,[1] but had the truth been known at the time, it would still have been impossible to fight Ross in the north and Warwick in the south at the same moment. In June, consequently, Mary of Gueldres sought another meeting with Warwick. A fifteen days' safeconduct which was drawn up on 17th June, and which was of truly generous proportions, as it extended protection not only to Warwick himself, but to the Earl of Kent, the Bishop of Durham, Lords Montagu, Greystock, Hastings, Ogle, and Lumley, the Prior of St. John's, Master William Witham, chancellor of the Exchequer, and Thomas Colt, seems to have been granted in the expectation that Warwick would enter Scotland again to meet Mary; but the meeting finally took place at Carlisle, and those who actually accompanied Warwick were the Bishops of Durham and Ely, the Earl of Essex, and Lords Wenlock and Hastings.[2]

The meeting at Carlisle secured the truce which Edward and Warwick so much desired. But it was only a brief truce, as it was to expire on St. Bartholomew's Day, and to secure it Warwick seems to have had to sacrifice the Earl of Douglas, who had just been serving Edward again by making raids across the border.[3] "Upon the appointment," wrote one of Paston's correspondents, "Earl Douglas is commanded to come thence, and as a sorrowful and a sore rebuked man lieth in the abbey of St. Albans; and by the said appointment shall not be reputed nor taken but as an Englishman, and if he come in the danger of the Scots, they to slay him." Paston was also told that King Henry and his adherents in Scotland were to be delivered up, but if this was a part of the agreement, it was not carried out, as Henry VI was not handed over to his enemies.[4] No doubt the Bishop of St. Andrews prevented that, if it was actually contemplated. Nor did Douglas suffer seriously; for three months had not elapsed before Edward was promising the earl that if he again made war on Scotland in his behalf and secured the aid of any Scots, he and those Scots should not be abandoned, but should be included in any treaty or truce that might be signed between England and Scotland.[1]

---

[1] Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland, II, 108-109; Hist. MSS. Com., Report 4, app., 487.

[2] Archæological Journal (London), XVII, 51-53; Paston Letters, IV, 50; Warrants for Issues, 2 Edw. IV, 1st July; Issue Roll, Easter 2 Edw. IV, 8th July. Hastings had married Warwick's sister Katharine in the spring of this year. Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 108.

[3] Paston Letters, IV, 44; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 159, 175.

[4] Paston Letters, IV, 50-51.

The truce with Scotland enabled Warwick to turn his attention to the English castles which were still holding out for Henry. Almost at once Montagu succeeded in wresting Naworth Castle, the principal seat of the Dacres of Gillesland, from Lord Dacre of Gillesland;[2] and in July Lord Hastings, Sir Ralph Grey, and Sir John Howard were sent to lay siege to Alnwick Castle, which some time since the preceding November had been captured by the Lancastrians and was now held by Sir William Tailboys. On 30th or 31st July Tailboys surrendered on promise of his life and goods, and Alnwick was then intrusted to the care of Sir Ralph Grey.[3] Even after these successes Edward IV could hardly say that he possessed the northernmost counties of his kingdom, but at least the work of conquering them was now well begun.

---

[1] Rymer, XI, 492.

[2] Worcester, 779. The news of this victory seems to have reached London simultaneously with the news of the truce. Paston Letters, *ut sup*. The report that Dacre, Sir Richard Tunstall, and Bellingham had been beheaded was untrue.

[3] Worcester, *ut sup.*; Kingsford's London Chron., 177; Flenley's Six Town Chron., 163; Fabyan, 652. See also Hearne's Fragment, 290, where the writer states, very incorrectly, that it was Pierre de Brezé who had captured Alnwick for Henry and who now surrendered it to Hastings.

CHAPTER VI

QUEEN MARGARET'S DISAPPOINTMENT

WHILE Mary of Gueldres was having meetings with Warwick, Margaret of Anjou was waiting anxiously for a meeting with Louis XI. Margaret had landed in Brittany on Good Friday, 16th April, and whether it was true or not that there had been Bretons in the ranks of Pembroke's and Wiltshire's army at Mortimer's Cross, Henry VI's consort received a cordial welcome from the Duke of Brittany, Francis II. The gifts which the duke made to the queen were reported to be worth twelve thousand crowns, and they were certainly valuable enough to call forth hearty thanks from King Henry.[1] But as Louis was still in the south of France, absorbed in his negotiations with John of Aragon and other matters, in May Margaret went to Angers to pay a visit to her father and to meet Pierre de Brezé, whom Louis by this time had set at liberty.[2] When he was informed of Margaret's arrival in his kingdom, Louis immediately sent the Seigneur de Basoches, bailli of Rouen, and Georges Havart, Seigneur de la Rosière, bailli of Caen, to Angers to greet her,[3] but for the personal interview which she had come to seek she would have to wait until the king returned from the south.

Early in June the Earl of Pembroke and Sir John Fortescue followed Margaret to France. They carried letters of credence from Henry which recommended Fortescue especially to Louis' favour, but on arriving in Flanders they made the unpleasant discovery that a license which Louis had given to all adherents of Henry VI to come and go through his domains, and on which they had relied, had been revoked because it was being abused, and that now all Englishmen, whether friends of Henry or of Edward, had to produce safeconducts before they could enter France. It was only after the Count of Charolais, to whom they appealed in their dilemma, had given them letters to Louis' officers explaining why they had no safeconducts that Henry's envoys were able to proceed on their journey,[1] and even after this Fortescue seems for some reason to have lingered by the way.[2] But Pembroke joined Margaret in time to be present at her meeting with Louis, and by that time an embassy from James III, consisting of the Bishop of Aberdeen, William Monypenny, Seigneur de Concressault, a Scot who had been for many years in the service of the king of France but still served the king of Scotland on occasion, and Thomas Lindsay, had arrived also, and Garter King-of-Arms was on hand to report to Edward IV as much of what was going on as he was able to find out.[3]

---

[1] Worcester, 779; Legrand collections, MS. français 6978, f. 70 dorso.
[2] Worcester, 780; Lettres de Louis XI, II, 47, note 2.
[3] Lettres de Louis XI, II, 46-47.

The meeting between Margaret and Louis took place in Touraine, and a secret agreement was signed between them at Chinon on 23rd June. Perhaps it was not Calais that Margaret had offered to Charles VII through Brezé and Doulcereau after the battle of St. Albans, but it was certainly Calais that she offered to Louis now. In return for a loan of twenty thousand francs she promised that, if Henry ever recovered Calais, either the Earl of Pembroke or the Earl of Kendal should be made captain of it, and that whichever earl received the captaincy should take an oath to deliver the town and castle to the king of France within a year or else repay within that time the twenty thousand francs. The promise Louis gave in exchange was that, in case Calais actually came into his possession in this manner, he would pay Henry forty thousand crowns.[4]

---

[1] See Henry's letter of credence for Fortescue and a letter sent to Louis from Rouen on 13th June, Waurin, III, 169-171, note. Mr. Plummer (Fortescue's Governance of England, 59, note, and 65, note) is inclined to think that these documents belong to the year 1465. But no letters of the Count of Charolais would have been honoured by Louis' officers in June, 1465, only a month before the battle of Montlhéry.

[2] He did not sign Margaret's treaty with Louis, nor does his name appear in the list of those who advised her in the matter.

[3] Legrand's history, MS. français 6960, f. 437. On Monypenny's history, see Lettres de Louis XI, III, 157, note. He shared in Brezé's raid on the Yorkshire coast in 1451 and was taken prisoner at that time. Nicolas's London Chron., 137.

[4] Waurin, III, 176-177. Only a month before this Louis had made an agreement with the Earl of Kendal. Kendal was promised very substantial favours, including the restoration of a part of the lands which had been held by his father, the Captal de Buch, and in return promised to give his allegiance to Louis after he had obtained a license from Henry VI to do so. Ordonnances des rois de France, XV, 482-489. Cf. Legeay, I, 301-302. Louis' purpose was to strengthen his hold on the south of France and on the Count of Foix, who was Kendal's kinsman. After he took possession of Roussillon and Cerdagne, he made Kendal his lieutenant in those counties. Calmette, 168.

As soon as he had secured this mortgage on Calais, Louis was ready to make a treaty, and his more open negotiations with Margaret were conducted at Tours. The queen was advised and assisted by the Earls of Pembroke and Kendal, Lords Hungerford and Roos, Doctor John Morton, who, since his escape from the Tower, had been appointed keeper of the privy seal to King Henry, Sir Edmund Mountfort, Sir Robert Whitingham, Sir Thomas Findern, Sir Henry Lowys, and William Grimsby, king-of-arms. Pierre de Brezé, Georges Havart, and Étienne Chevalier acted for Louis. The negotiations were interrupted for a moment by an event which occurred at the chateau of Blois. On 27th June the Duchess of Orleans gave birth to a son at the chateau, and although the occasion was not one which excited real pleasure in Louis' heart, he and Margaret took time to share the honour of standing as sponsors for the child, who received his reluctant godfather's name and thirty-six years later ascended the throne of France as Louis XII.[1] But on the 28th the treaty was signed. A hundred years' truce between Henry and Louis was to begin at once, and the subjects of either king were to be at liberty to visit the domains of the other without safeconducts, although so long as the present troubles continued in England, any Englishman coming to France must be prepared to show a certificate from Henry or Margaret proving that he was their subject, and until Henry and Margaret were re-established in England, no subjects of theirs were to go to Gascony for trade or for any other purpose without a license from the king of France. Each king promised also not to enter into any alliance with rebellious subjects of the other; and Louis agreed to grant no more safeconducts to adherents of Edward IV, aside from the usual ones for fishermen and prisoners; to make known to his subjects, friends, and allies that he favoured Henry's cause, and to announce throughout his domains that his subjects were forbidden, on pain of forfeiture, to carry to England, or to any other place acknowledging Edward's sovereignty, any corn, wine, or other victuals or merchandise.[2]

The treaty of Tours was signed by Margaret, Pembroke, Kendal, Hungerford, Roos, Doctor Morton, and Sir Edmund Mountfort;

---

[1] Du Clercq, liv. IV, c. xli; Commynes-Lenglet, II, 176; Maulde-la-Clavière, Histoire de Louis XII, Pt. I, Vol. I, 103-104.

[2] For the full text of the treaty, see Commynes-Lenglet, II, 367-373, and also Martène and Durand, Veterum Scriptorum et Monumentorum Historicorum, Dogmaticorum, Moralium, Amplissima Collectio, IX, 1464-1470.

and so confident were they all that a little aid from the king of France was all that was needed to seat Henry on his throne again, that they promised Louis that he should have a ratification of the treaty by the English parliament, as well as by Henry himself, before Christmas. Perhaps Louis did not feel quite as sure about the outcome as did Margaret and her friends, but for the sake of giving Edward and Warwick a fright, he was willing to risk some money and also a few men. So Margaret got both the twenty thousand francs, the first payment for Calais, and a promise that Brezé should raise an army and accompany her back to Scotland. Those who disliked Louis declared that he chose Brezé for this task in order to get rid of a man he hated, but undoubtedly no other choice could have been made which would have pleased Margaret so well. Not only had Brezé long been the queen's friend, but he was also one of the most distinguished veterans of the wars against the English, and if the statements of his panegyrist, Chastellain, are to be believed, he understood the English and their ways better than any other man in Louis' kingdom.[1]

As soon as all was settled, Brezé set out for Normandy to begin preparations for his expedition to Scotland and Margaret followed after, attended by his brother, the Archbishop of Narbonne. As Louis had sent orders that the English queen was to be received with as much honour as would be shown to the queen of France herself, Margaret was met as she approached Rouen on 13th July by a deputation of citizens who delivered an address of welcome, and gifts were presented to her as soon as she entered the city gates.[2] But more to the queen's pleasure than any gifts from the citizens of Rouen was one which came from the Duke of Brittany. As soon as Louis had agreed to assist her, Margaret had sent envoys to Nantes to tell Francis II that Louis wished him to let her have sixty thousand crowns; and although this was more money than the duke was prepared to part with, and although some of his councillors were inclined to distrust what Louis said about his own generous intentions towards the queen, he went so far as to send a thousand crowns to Margaret at Rouen. He also arrested all English merchants in Brittany who had no safeconducts to show and ordered a muster of his troops on 15th August with a view to making war on Edward IV.[1]

---

[1] Chastellain, IV, 227-228. Cf. Basin, II, 27; Du Cercq, liv. IV, c. xliii; and Waurin, II, 317.

[2] Lettres de Louis XI, II, 61; Commynes-Lenglet, II, 12; Beaurepaire, Inventaire-sommaire des archives communales, Ville de Rouen, I, 63. According to Chastellain, Somerset was with Margaret in Normandy. But that seems to be a mistake.

Certainly Margaret had reason to feel, as she rested at Rouen, that her journey to France had accomplished a great deal. Yet disappointment was in store for her, and in the very quarter in which she felt most secure.

In fulfilment of his treaty with Margaret, Louis caused proclamations against Edward and his adherents to be made throughout his kingdom and, like his father before him, he wrote to the king of Scotland and the Bishop of St. Andrews telling them what he had done and exhorting them to assist Henry.[2] He also began preparations to attack Calais and sent an envoy to Philip of Burgundy to make three requests. He wanted Philip to let the Count of Charolais take command of the army he proposed to send against Calais, to grant that army passage across his territories, and to allow the ships of Holland and Zeland to assist in the attack. But Philip, who had already refused to permit Louis' proclamation against Edward to be cried in his domains, declined these proposals as indignantly as he had declined all other proposals injurious to Edward, and in consequence the expedition against Calais had to be given up.[3] "As for the siege of Calais," wrote one of Paston's friends in the latter part of July, "we hear no more thereof, blessed be God."[4]

The failure of his plans in regard to Calais cooled Louis' desire to assist Margaret not a little, yet, when he entered Rouen on 10th August, Brezé rode by his side, and on the 16th he gave orders for the impressment of ships and mariners to carry the queen back to her husband.[5] But in the meantime there were very disquieting rumours about an English fleet which was lying at Sandwich. As early as 28th July Louis had written to the bailli of Caen that some English ships had been seen on the sea and that, as no one knew what they meant to do, he was sending the captain of Caen to call

[1] Morice, Mémoires pour servir de preuves à l'histoire ecclesiastique et civile de Bretagne, III, 66; Legrand's history, MS. français 6960, ff. 438-439; Dupuy, Hist. de la réunion de la Bretagne à la France, I, 39. Louis afterwards took Francis to task for entering into an alliance with Margaret without his sanction! Mourice, III, 45.

[2] Basin, II, 49; Chastellain, IV, 270; Instructions to Monypenny, Waurin, III, 167-168.

[3] Chastellain, IV, 225-227, 274-275; Du Clercq, liv. IV, c. xlii.

[4] Paston Letters, IV, 50.

[5] Chastellain, IV, 229-230, 273; Beaurepaire, Notes sur six voyages de Louis XI à Rouen, Précis analytique des travaux de l'Académie de Rouen, 1855-1856, p. 286; Commynes-Lenglet, II, 373.

together the nobles of the country to resist the English if they should attempt a landing.[1] Before he reached Rouen he had grown so anxious that he had sent out a couple of boats to pick up information about what was happening on Edward IV's side of the sea. One of these boats returned a day or two after Louis arrived at Rouen with word that fourteen large English ships and twenty-one small ones were sailing along the southern coast of England. These ships *might* be going to Ireland, but it was said they were on their way to attack Bordeaux or Bayonne and that the king of England would have not less than one hundred and twenty, or even two hundred ships when all were assembled. A letter from Boulogne confirmed this news and added that the English fleet would carry from sixteen to twenty thousand soldiers. Louis refused to credit such figures, but he began to look after his coast defences, and he held himself in readiness to go to Bordeaux should it prove necessary.[2]

Although the stories Louis heard about the English fleet were, as he thought, exaggerated, a fleet had been assembling at Sandwich; and as Warwick felt that his presence was still needed in the north, the Earl of Kent on 30th July, when it was ready to sail, was appointed admiral.[3] The king, with the chancellor, the Earl of Worcester, now treasurer of England,[4] and other lords, even made a hasty journey from Fotheringay to Sandwich to review the fleet; and yet the thirty-five ships that had worried the king of France soon returned to port, and the entire fleet seems to have remained there in idleness for several weeks.[5]

Probably the fleet was held at Sandwich because the anxiety about Calais had become acute again and it remained to be seen where the king's ships would be needed most. For Margaret went from Rouen to Boulogne, and as soon as her presence at Boulogne became known in England, it was suspected that she was trying to bribe her way into Calais. On 21st August the Earl of Worcester, the Prior of St. John's, and other members of the king's council went before the common council of London, where Worcester read to the council a letter from the king and, after stating that Margaret and the king of France were plotting against Calais, asked for a loan of thirty-four hundred pounds.[1] About the same time one who had been in London wrote to John Paston that the Earl of Worcester had arrested forty ships in the Thames which, it was said, were to carry reinforcements to Calais "for fear of the king of France for a siege." "It was told me secretly," the writer continued, "that there were two hundred in Calais sworn contrary to the king's will, and for default of their wages, and that Queen Margaret was ready at Boulogne with much silver to pay the soldiers in case they would give her entrance. Many men be greatly afraid of this matter, and so the treasurer hath much to do for this cause."[2]

---

[1] Lettres de Louis XI, X, 180-181.

[2] *Ibid.*, II, 68, 71-73; Legrand collections, MS. français 6969, f. 59.

[3] Rymer, XI, 490; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 195, 201, 203-204, 206; Hist. MSS. Com., Various Collections, IV, 204.

[4] He had succeeded the Earl of Essex as treasurer in April. Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 182. Cf. Warrants under the Signet, file 1377, 12th April.

[5] Privy Seals; Chron. of John Stone, 86-87; Lettres de Louis XI, II, 73.

So alarming did the situation at Calais appear that it was thought the king himself would have to go to the rescue—"for the soldiers are so wild there," declared Paston's informant, "that they will not let in any man but the king or my Lord Warwick." Perhaps with that intention in mind, Edward came down to London from Fotheringay on 4th September and from there immediately issued a proclamation requiring all men between the ages of sixteen and sixty to be ready to come at his call. He also demanded that the livery companies of the city should supply him with three hundred archers for service at sea, as his enemies had so many ships hanging about that it was impossible for English ships to cross from the home ports to Calais.[3] But in the end means were found to pacify the garrison of Calais, and the king was not called upon to cross the sea to quell a mutiny.

It was the merchants of the staple, always interested parties when Calais was concerned, who came to the king's assistance. But the staplers demanded their reward, which in this instance was the settlement, already referred to, of their accumulated claims against the crown for money provided by them for the custody of Calais and for the wages of the captain and soldiers of the garrison. These claims amounted to £40,917 19*s.* 2*d.* q^{a}, but three thousand marks (£2,000) of this sum the merchants were induced to release to the king, and then, on 16th September, they were authorized to take for themselves a certain portion of the subsidy and custom of wool and woolfells shipped from England to Calais by persons not members of their society, and also to ship wool and woolfells themselves from any port of the realm to Calais without paying custom or subsidy, until by these means they had recovered all that was due to them.[1] After this grant had been made to them, the staplers seem to have consented to advance a half year's pay, £6,872 7*s.* 4*d.*, for the garrison.[2] Finally, by a decree of the king and his council, one half of the receipts from the wool custom and subsidy in the ports of Sandwich and Boston was assigned to the captain and soldiers until the debt to them was paid, and a commission was appointed to determine just what that debt was.[3] Thanks to these measures and to the presence of Sir William Pecche, who was sent over from England with a couple of hundred men,[4] the garrison of Calais was held under control and Margaret of Anjou was kept out of the place. But it had been a close call.

---

[1] The king was promised only a thousand pounds at this time, but he had asked for money earlier in the month also, and the two appeals together brought him something over two thousand pounds. London Journal 7, ff. 6-9.

[2] Paston Letters, IV, 57-58. Calais seems to have been in the care, at this time, of Lord Duras, who in June had been sentenced at Bordeaux for leze majesty against the king of France. Record Transcripts, Series II, no. 136 (7). He had been elected a knight of the Garter sometime since 13th November, 1461, and the Garter was sent to him at Calais. Beltz, clxiii; Issue Roll, Easter 2 Edw. IV, 14th July.

[3] Privy Seals; Paston Letters, IV, 52; London Journal 7, f. 9b.

Calais was not the only part of Edward's kingdom which was giving him cause for much anxiety, and the thirty-five ships that returned to Sandwich may really have made a voyage to Ireland. For although the memory of the Duke of York was still cherished in Ireland, and although the Anglo-Irish had gladly confirmed the attainder of the late Earl of Wiltshire and Ormond by the parliament of England, the friends of the Butler family refused to recognize that attainder, and sometime during the past few months Sir John Butler, Wiltshire's brother, who now claimed the earldom of Ormond, had landed in Ireland, captured the son of the Earl of Desmond, and destroyed the city of Waterford. No doubt Butler was fighting for his own interests rather than for those of the house of Lancaster, but Margaret was sure to take advantage of what he had been doing in Ireland if she could find any way to do so, and the letter which told Paston about Margaret's presence at Boulogne stated also that there had been no tidings from Ireland for three weeks and that it looked, consequently, as if there was "much to do there by the Earl of Pembroke." But in reality Pembroke was not in Ireland at all, but in France with Margaret, and the fright which Butler's doings had caused, like the fright about Calais, was soon over. The Butlers and the Geraldines met each other "with an odious, ireful countenance" at Pilltown, and the Earl of Desmond was rewarded for the bloody victory he won there with the deputy-governorship of Ireland under the Duke of Clarence, to whom the lieutenancy of Ireland had been given at the beginning of the year.[1]

---

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 222.

[2] See an indenture between the king and the staplers in Signed Bills, file 1492, no. 3853, 18th Nov.

[3] *Ibid.*, file 1491, no. 3845; French Roll 2 Edw. IV, m. 2 and 7.

[4] Issue Roll, Mich. 2 Edw. IV, 6th Oct.

When the whole fleet, under the command of the Earl of Kent, assisted by Lord Clinton, Lord Say, and Sir John Howard, at last sailed out of the harbour of Sandwich, where it had lain so long, it proceeded at once to attack the coast of France, just as Louis had feared it would. Brittany came first, and the town of Le Conquet, near Brest, was pillaged and burned; but from Le Conquet Edward's ships moved southward, first to the Ile-Dieu, where, if they did little damage, they at least frightened the people of the neighbouring island of Noirmoutier into repairing the fortifications of their chateau, and then to the Ile de Ré, where more pillaging was done. In great anxiety Louis hurried to Bressuire, but he had no fleet in readiness and was practically helpless.[2]

Although a story which soon came to England that the Earl of Kent had encountered sixty French, Breton, and Spanish merchantmen and captured fifty of them[3] seems to have had no foundation in fact, the earl had done quite enough to avenge the never-forgotten raid of Pierre de Brezé on the coast of Kent, and also to frighten the king of France and the Duke of Brittany.[4] Francis II sent no more money to Margaret of Anjou and said nothing more about making war on Edward IV, while Louis' interest in Margaret declined to such an extent that, although he did not openly repudiate the promises he had made to her, he ceased to enforce the proclamation which he had issued on her behalf[1] and took no further steps to supply her with men or ships.

---

[1] Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters, IV, 1021-1023; Annals of Ireland, translated from the Irish by Dudley Firbisse, 247-248; Facsimiles of National MSS. of Ireland, Pt. III, no. xlviii; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 142, 263, 270; Gilbert, Viceroys of Ireland, 377-378; Exchequer T. R., Council and Privy Seal, file 89, m. 27. Roland Fitz-Eustace, Lord of Portlester, was Clarence's first deputy. He was succeeded first by William Sherwood, Bishop of Meath, and then by Desmond.

[2] Kingsford's London Chron., 177; Stow, 416; Chastellain, IV, 270-271, 276; Marchegay, Annuaire départ. de la Société d'Émulation de la Vendée, 1858-1859, pp. 175-176; Morice, III, 44-45; Lettres de Louis XI, II, 74-80. For proof that Lord Say shared in the Earl of Kent's expedition, see Issue Roll, Easter 2 Edw. IV, 14th July.

[3] Paston Letters, IV, 57.

[4] Chastellain says the English pillaged the coast of Brittany "en revenge de ce que les Bretons du temps du roy Charles avoient fait le pareil en Angleterre sous messire Pierre de Brezé."

The Earl of Kent's expedition went far towards teaching Louis the lesson Edward and Warwick wished him to learn—the lesson that any aid which he gave to Margaret of Anjou was less likely to render England innocuous by prolonging her civil war than it was to bring on a renewal of the old war between England and France, the very thing he wanted to make impossible. And Louis was wise enough to realize, also, that if by any imprudence or miscalculation he drove Edward and Warwick to take up arms against him, he would have to fight not only England but Burgundy. For Philip of Burgundy's dislike of the man he had once sheltered in his bosom was now so generally understood that it was rumoured that he had instigated Kent's raid; and although when he heard that such a tale was going about, the duke wrote to assure Louis of its falseness, and although Louis replied that, had such a story reached his ears, he would never have believed it, and filled his letter with expressions of gratitude and confidence,[2] neither put any faith in what the other wrote. At the same time Philip was really anxious to keep on good terms with Louis, and that desire probably explains why some ambassadors to whom Edward gave a commission on 18th September, in the midst of Kent's exploits, to treat with Philip for an extension of the truce and intercourse of merchandise between England and Burgundy did not cross the sea.[3] Calais Pursuivant made several journeys to the Burgundian court with letters, however, and as soon as the English fleet returned home, Philip was ready to receive an English embassy. On 24th October a new commission to treat with Philip was given to Lord Wenlock, Thomas Vaughan, and Louis Galet, and before the end of the year the treaty between England and Burgundy was prolonged for another twelvemonth.[4] Even the Count of Charolais began to show signs of a change of heart towards the house of York and late in November sent one of his secretaries to London.[5]

[1] Instructions to Monypenny, Waurin, III, 168-169.

[2] Lettres de Louis XI, II, 81-83.

[3] Rymer, XI, 491.

[4] Issue Roll, Mich. 2 Edw. IV, 26th Oct. and 3rd Nov.; Rymer, XI, 493, 497. Wenlock was paid £112 for this embassy. Issue Roll, Mich. 2 Edw. IV, 20th Nov.

[5] On 29th November the common council of London agreed that the mayor should invite this visitor to dinner on that day. London Journal 7, f. 17b.

It was not only through Burgundy that Edward was able to cause Louis uneasiness and make him stop and consider what might follow if he blundered into war with the present wearer of the English crown. By his league with John of Aragon and Gaston de Foix, Louis had brought himself into awkward relations with Castile, whose ancient alliance with France he had taken some steps towards renewing.[1] For Blanche, the sister of the dead Don Carlos, had transferred, when her cause became hopeless, all her rights to the crown of Navarre to her divorced husband, Henry the Impotent of Castile, and in August the Catalonians, finding themselves in danger of being crushed by the combined strength of John and Louis, had proclaimed Henry as their lord and persuaded him to send a force of men to their assistance.[2] Of all these events Edward had received prompt information through two Gascons who were keeping watch for him in Spain, Bernard de la Forsse and Louis de Bretaylle;[3] and it did not take him long to see that they gave him an opportunity to get even with Louis in the Spanish peninsula. On 16th September he commissioned the Dean of St. Severin's, Doctor Thomas Kent, a clerk of the council and an experienced diplomatist,[4] and Thomas Herbert, a brother of Lord Herbert, to go to Spain to treat with Henry the Impotent and his brother-in-law, the king of Portugal. To these ambassadors, when they left London on 22nd October, he gave the task of renewing the alliance which had existed once upon a time between England and Castile and of preventing Louis from making any more friends south of the Pyrenees.[1]

---

[1] Daumet, Étude sur l'alliance de la France et de la Castille au XIV^e et XV^e siècles, 104-105.

[2] Calmette, 170-174.

[3] These two men, whom we shall often find associated together, seem to have been first sent abroad by Edward in the summer of 1462. Issue Roll, Easter 2 Edw. IV, 21st July. The Dean of St. Severin's and his colleagues, during their embassy to Spain, paid them twenty pounds for certain secret matters. Issue Roll, Easter 3 Edw. IV, 19th July. Further information about Louis de Bretaylle, who enjoys undying fame for the simple reason that he loaned Earl Rivers the book from which the earl made the translation Caxton printed under the title "The Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers," may be found in Writs of Privy Seal, file 786, no. 417, and file 797, no. 1372; Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, 497-499; École des Chartes, XXXVIII, 5-48; Excerpta Historica, 214-215. He had been a retainer of the Earl of Kendal at one time and had performed valiant deeds under the great Talbot in France.

[4] Kent was one of the two clerks of the king's council, Richard Langport being the other. He was also secondary in the office of the privy seal. Enrolments of Wardrobe Accounts (Exchequer L. T. R.), roll 6, m. 53; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 126. Kent and Langport had been joint clerks of the council under Henry VI as well, and Kent was one of two ambassadors sent in 1449 to negotiate with the Duchess of Burgundy. Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 425; Privy Council Proceedings, VI, 76. A few years later, when he was sent on an embassy to Prussia, he was taken at sea by the Hansards and held a prisoner at Lubeck for some time. Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 119.

So it happened that Louis, after having taken so much pains to avert an alliance between Edward and John of Aragon, now found himself in danger of having to contend with an alliance between Edward and Henry of Castile. And with Castile to aid them, what trouble might not Edward and Warwick make him if he stirred their wrath by helping Margaret of Anjou? In his mind's eye Louis could already see an English and Castilian army invading Guienne.

For several reasons, therefore, Louis repented more and more of his promises to Margaret; and when, late in October, the queen at last set sail for Scotland, only about eight hundred men, under Brezé's command, went with her and the wages of these men seem to have been paid, not by Louis, but by Brezé himself.[2] Forty-two ships carried Margaret's little army across the sea, and after touching at the coast of Scotland just long enough, apparently, to take on board King Henry, the Duke of Somerset, and a few Scottish soldiers, the queen landed on the coast of Northumberland on 25th October.

As Bamborough was in the hands of Sir William Tunstall, a brother of Sir Richard Tunstall, Margaret found a welcome and a refuge there, but no sign was to be seen of the general rising of the people of northern England on Henry's behalf which she had hoped would take place as soon as it was known that he had come and had brought an army with him. Evidently Henry would have to make his way inch by inch. Consequently, leaving Somerset, Pembroke, Roos, and Sir Ralph Percy, who by this time had thrown off his pretended allegiance to Edward, in charge of Bamborough, the queen rode away to lay siege to Alnwick Castle. As rations were short in

---

[1] See Taster's and Kent's account for this embassy, Foreign Roll 3 Edw. IV, no. 97; a letter from Antonio de Noceta to the Duke of Milan, Calmette, 446; an extract from the Annales of Alonso de Palencia, *ibid.*, 451; Warrants for Issues, 2 Edw. IV, 30th Sept.; and Issue Roll, Mich. 2 Edw. IV, 27th and 29th Oct. Each of the ambassadors was to receive 20*s.* a day. Rougecroix Pursuivant accompanied them, and so did William Tilghman, one of the clerks in the office of the privy seal, to do the writing and engrossing. Issue Roll, *ut sup.*

[2] Chastellain, IV, 230-231; Basin, II, 49-50. Brezé told Chastellain that he was fifty thousand crowns out of pocket through his expedition to Scotland with Margaret.

Alnwick, the castle soon surrendered, and it was then handed over to the care of Brezé's son, Lord Hungerford, Sir Robert Whitingham, Sir Thomas Findern, and some five or six hundred Frenchmen.[1] But the capture of Alnwick, though so comforting, was all that Margaret was destined to accomplish.

Edward was in London when he heard that Margaret and Brezé had arrived in Northumberland and established themselves in Bamborough, and instantly he began to make preparations to go north to meet them. On 30th October, evidently the very day on which the news of Margaret's coming was received, the city of London was asked for a loan of three thousand marks for the king's "great voyage," and the common council, shivering at the thought that Margaret might appear at their gates with another horde of plunderers, agreed to provide two thousand marks in all haste.[2] On the same day orders were sent to Kingston-upon-Hull to have ships ready for the king at his coming thither, and four days later Edward left London so hurriedly that his artillery and supplies had to follow later.[3] But with all his haste, the king could not reach Northumberland for some time, and it was fortunate that Warwick was already in the north. A special commission had been dispatched to the earl authorizing him to raise the royal standard against the French and the Scots who, at the instigation of Henry and Margaret, the commission stated, were disturbing the peace of the realm;[4] and while the king was speeding northward, Warwick was already at work in Northumberland.

The news that both Edward and Warwick were descending upon her frightened Margaret at once into flight. On 13th November she "broke her field" and took to her ships, with Henry, Brezé, and such of her French soldiers as had not been left to guard the Northumbrian castles. But her usual bad luck pursued her. A storm scattered her little fleet, and she and Henry and Brezé were all but drowned by the foundering of the carvel in which they had hoped to reach Scotland. They escaped to Berwick in a fishing boat, but the carvel went to the bottom and, with it, much of the queen's "stuff." Three of the other ships, which carried about four hundred Frenchmen commanded by Jean Malet, Seigneur de Graville, another Norman nobleman who, like Brezé, had served France devotedly during the long struggle with her English invaders, also came to grief. They were driven on to the rocks near Bamborough, and when it was evident that nothing could save them, Graville put the torch to them and took refuge in the church on the island of Lindisfarne. In the church the Frenchmen were soon attacked by one John Manners and the Bastard of Ogle, a natural son or brother of Lord Ogle; and although they outnumbered their enemies, if we may believe the English chronicler's statement, by two to one, before the fight was over every man in the church was either killed or captured.[1] The Seigneur de Graville himself, with one "Sir Cardot Malorte," was carried to London and placed in the "ward and rule" of Dame Agnes Foster, or Forster.[2] The two Frenchmen fell into good hands, for Dame Agnes was a sort of fifteenth century Elizabeth Fry who built an addition to Ludgate prison at her own expense and induced the common council of London to order certain reforms in the management of all the city's prisons;[3] but Graville at least, if not Sir Cardot also, was destined to be a prisoner for many a day to come. His son, Louis Malet, was one of Louis XI's specially trusted councillors, and a little effort on the part of the son would probably have secured the father's release; but the effort was not made.[4]

---

[1] Gregory, 218; Worcester, 780.

[2] London Journal 7, f. 15. On 24th December the common council granted the king £1000 more towards the expenses of the siege of Alnwick, Bamborough, and Dunstanborough. *Ibid.*, f. 18b. £2000 of the city's money was sent to Edward at Durham. Issue Roll, Mich. 2 Edw. IV, 23rd March.

[3] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 231; Worcester, 780; Issue Roll, Mich. 2 Edw. IV, 26th Oct.; Hist. MSS. Com., Report 5, app., 523. The gunners, one of whom evidently hailed from the Netherlands, as he rejoiced in the name of Haufverderkyn, joined the king at Durham. Issue Roll, Mich. 2 Edw. IV., 11th Nov.

[4] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 231. Although this commission was not sealed until 6th November, it was undoubtedly on its way to the earl before that date.

Six days after Margaret's flight Edward reached York, and as soon as York had equipped a band of men for his service, he went on to Durham.[1] But the Bishop of Durham received no favours during this royal visit. The proximity of Henry and Margaret had proved too much for the new-found affection of Lawrence Booth for the house of York, and Edward had already given orders for the seizure of the temporalities of his confessor's bishopric. Booth's possessions were handed over to the custody of Fogge and Scott, treasurer and comptroller of the royal household, and one hundred and seventy-four " beeves " and one hundred and seventy-nine " muttons " which were found in the bishop's pastures helped to feed the king and his household during the months of November and December. Towards the expenses of the same household went also sums amounting to nearly six hundred pounds which were extracted from the bishop's purse from time to time before the temporalities of his see were finally restored to him eighteen months later.[2]

---

[1] Gregory, 218-219; Kingsford's London Chron., 177-178; Hearne's Fragment, 291; Fabyan, 653; Worcester, 780; Waurin, II, 320. Cf. Buchanan, Bk. XII, c.iv. There is a curiously twisted account of these events in Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 156.

[2] See a petition which one Roland Martyn, priest, sent to the chancery during the time that George Neville, Archbishop of York, was chancellor. In this petition Martyn states that, at the request of three servants of the Earl of Warwick, he went to the house of Dame Agnes Foster, widow, by license of her servants, to speak with "Lord Gravyle and Sir Cardot Malorte, prisoners in the ward and rule of the said Dame Agnes," and that now the said Dame Agnes accused him of coming into her house without her license and with force of arms to carry away the said prisoners and had brought action against him. Early Chancery Proceedings, bundle 31, no. 446.

[3] London Letter Book L, f. 22b.

[4] Scofield, Eng. Hist. Review, July, 1910, p. 547.

Undoubtedly it was Edward's intention to go on to Northumberland, but at Durham he fell a victim to " the sickness of the measles " and had to stay there.[3] All that he could do was to dispatch the troops he had brought with him to the assistance of Warwick,[4] who by now was laying siege to all three of the great Northumbrian castles, Alnwick, Dunstanborough, and Bamborough. The Earl of Kent and Lord Scales were fighting the Frenchmen Margaret had left in Alnwick, the Earl of Worcester and Sir Ralph Grey were attacking Dunstanborough, which was defended by Sir Richard Tunstall, Sir Philip Wentworth, and Doctor John Morton, with a garrison of several hundred men, and Lord Montagu and Lord Ogle were pitted against Somerset, Pembroke, Roos, and Percy at Bamborough. But from Warkworth Castle Warwick, with the help of Lords Wenlock, Cromwell, and Grey of Codnor, was directing all the operations.[1] The three castles were hard pressed, but Warwick's task was no light one and he needed the king's troops, as the castles' defenders were looking for support from Scotland which might come any day. "Please it you to wit," wrote young Paston from the scene of battle on 11th December, "that as this day we had tidings here that the Scots will come into England within seven days after the writing of this letter for to rescue these three castles." However, this young man, if not his commander, wasted no worry on the Scots. There was ordnance in plenty, he declared, both for the siege of the castles and for a battle in the field, "in case that there be any field taken, as I trow there shall none be not yet, for the Scots keep no promise." And he added gaily: "Make as merry as ye can, for there is no jeopardy not yet."[2]

---

[1] Privy Seals; Davies, York Records, 18, 22.

[2] Accounts, etc. (Exchequer K. R.) bundle 411, no. 13; Rymer, XI, 518; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 325, 347, 374-375; Writs of Privy Seal, file 797, nos. 1376 and 1382.

[3] Kingsford's London Chron., 178. Fabyan calls the king's malady " the sickness of pockys," which might be taken to mean something more serious than measles. (On the meaning of the word *pox* in England in the Middle Ages, see Creighton's Hist. of Epidemics in Britain, I, 415, 455.) A debt of nearly eighty-eight pounds to the king's apothecary for certain " stuff of his occupation " delivered to the king's use by the " oversight " of his physicians which Edward ordered to be paid in March, 1464, probably dated back to the time of this long illness at Durham. Warrants for Issues, 4 Edw. IV, 25th March. Cf. Issue Roll, Easter 4 Edw. IV, 7th May.

[4] Davies, York Records, 22.

Perhaps the defenders of Bamborough and Dunstanborough had much the same opinion of the Scots as young Paston, for they grew weary of waiting for relief and on Christmas Eve made an offer of surrender. The offer was accompanied, however, with a demand that Sir Ralph Percy should be given the custody of the two castles after he had sworn allegiance to Edward, and, little reason as Edward had to trust Percy, this condition was accepted. Then, on Sunday, 26th December, Bamborough capitulated, and on the following day Dunstanborough. Somerset, Percy, Sir Henry Lowys, Sir Nicholas Latimer, and a few of the other prisoners were immediately conducted to Edward at Durham, where all of them swore that they would be the king's true liegemen henceforth and forever. As soon as this was done, Bamborough and Dunstanborough were handed over to Percy. Somerset was sent to assist Warwick in the siege of Alnwick, and for the rest of the time he made himself conspicuous by the zeal he displayed in the cause of Edward IV. But the Earl of Pembroke and Lord Roos were less complacent than Somerset. As they were unable to obtain a promise that their estates would be restored to them, they preferred to accept a safeconduct from Edward and withdraw to Scotland.[3]

In spite of Paston's uncomplimentary remarks about the Scots, at the moment Bamborough and Dunstanborough surrendered a Scottish army, led by Brezé and the Earl of Angus, was on its way to their relief. And Edward and Warwick were aware of this fact if the defenders of the castles were not; for the day after Dunstanborough was taken Edward wrote to the chancellor in London, telling him that Bamborough and Dunstanborough had surrendered, that the Duke of Somerset had submitted "for his life only, without any exception," and that the Scots, who had promised the Frenchmen in Alnwick "solemnly into the uttermost article of their honour to rescue them," were planning to enter England on the coming Monday or Tuesday.[1] Three days later, in another letter, the king told the Archbishop of York that the Scots were coming on the following Monday (3rd January) not only to attempt to relieve Alnwick, but "to give us battle," and bade the archbishop bring all the clergy of his province in defensible array to Newcastle Moor to assist him.[2]

---

[1] Paston Letters, IV, 59-60; Excerpta Historica, 365; Worcester, 780; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 158-159.

[2] Paston Letters, *ut sup.*

[3] Worcester, 780-781; Gregory, 219; Rolls of Parl., VI, 230. One John Karre was paid twenty marks for his labour and expense in connection with the making of the terms for the surrender of Bamborough. Issue Roll, Mich. 2 Edw. IV, 3rd March.

Edward stated in his letter to the chancellor that he was making ready to resist the Scots and would "join thereto our body" in the defence of his realm; but, owing to continued illness or some other cause, he was still at Durham[3] when, on 5th January, only two days later than they were expected, Brezé and Angus appeared in the neighbourhood of Alnwick. And Brezé and Angus brought with them an army so much larger than Warwick's that at their approach the earl, whose troops had lost courage by waiting so long and by exposure to the cold and the rain, thought it wise to withdraw to a more sheltered position between the castle and a marsh. When the Scots saw Warwick moving away, they suspected a ruse and were afraid to advance, but Hungerford and his men, who by this time were reduced to such straits for food that they were devouring their horses, threw open the castle gates, when their rescuers seemed to hesitate, and marched out to join them. So near was Warwick at the moment that the evacuation of the castle was carried out in full sight of his army, and more than one chronicler declares that, had Brezé, "the best warrior of all that time,"[4] attacked the earl then and there, he would have scored a great victory. But Angus, whose courage may have been dulled by illness, as he died shortly after these events, preferred to run no risks. To the great mortification of Brezé, the Scots retired without striking a blow, and the following morning the few men Hungerford had left in the castle when he marched out surrendered to Warwick.[1]

---

[1] Harleian MS. 543, f. 145. This letter has been printed in Davies' York Records, and also in Halliwell's Letters of the Kings of England, but in neither case quite accurately. One John Laurens was paid 20s. for carrying a letter to the chancellor from the king at Durham. Issue Roll, Mich. 2 Edw. IV, 14th March.

[2] Raine, Priory of Hexham, I, cvii.

[3] Privy Seals.

[4] Warkworth, 2. It is interesting to contrast this tribute to Brezé by a

So Queen Margaret's great venture had completely failed. Incapable of seeing, or else determined not to see, that to attempt to restore Henry to his throne by the help of the French was only to excite the hatred of all loyal Englishmen, she had sought to buy Louis' help by the sacrifice of Calais, as she had already bought Scotland's help by the sacrifice of Berwick, and then, coming back accompanied by the very Frenchman whom her husband's former subjects hated most, she had expected England to rise and welcome her! And bitter were her surprise and disappointment when her efforts resulted in nothing but the loss of all that remained to the house of Lancaster in the north of England. Now that the Northumbrian castles had fallen, Edward was "possessed of all England except a castle in North Wales called Harlech,"[2] and the crown was farther from Henry's grasp than ever.

---

contemporary Englishman with Hall's description of him as a man "more fierce in the house than in the field, and yet more fierce in flying from the field to the house than hardy to set forward from the house to the field." Hall, 258-259.

[1] Worcester, 780; Warkworth, *ut sup.;* Lesley, 35; Gregory, 220; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 176. Cf. Waurin, II, 317-319, and Du Clercq, liv. IV, c.xliii. The French chroniclers, confused, apparently, by the fact that Brezé's son was in Alnwick with Hungerford, state that Brezé himself was defending the castle and give great credit to Angus for the relief of the place. See Waurin and Du Clercq, *ut sup.;* Chastellain, IV, 231; Basin, II, 50; Buchanan, Bk. XII, c.v.; Lesley, *ut sup.;* Major, Bk. VI, c.xix.

[2] Warkworth, 3.

CHAPTER VII

THE TREACHERY OF PERCY AND GREY

WORSE than vain though Margaret's efforts proved to be in the end, the Northumbrian castles had not been easily won. For a time it had seemed so likely that military matters, and perhaps illness also, would keep the king in the north all winter that when, just before Christmas, writs were sent out summoning another parliament to meet on 5th February, the city of York was named as the meeting place. But after the fall of Alnwick new writs were issued, changing the date of meeting to 7th March and the place to Leicester, and about the middle of January Edward turned his face again towards London.[1]

The king reached Fotheringay on the 26th, and it was probably four days later that he celebrated with costly pomp his father's obit, or, more correctly speaking, as the Duke of York's death occurred on 30th December, not on 30th January, his father's "month-mind." Not long after his victory at Towton Edward had set up a hearse, or catafalque, at St. Paul's in his father's honour—a hearse on which many candles must have been burned, as one of London's grocers supplied more than eighty pounds' worth of wax for it[2]—and it was probably this same hearse, "powdered" with silver roses and golden suns, which had been sent up to Fotheringay from London for the present occasion. With the hearse had come also much other funeral paraphernalia, including four large banners displaying the arms of Saint George, Saint Edward, France, and England and France, a "majesty cloth" on which was wrought an image of Our Lord sitting on a rainbow, fifty-one gilded images of kings, and four hundred and twenty gilded images of angels.[3]

---

[1] Reports touching Dignity of a Peer, IV, 956-963; Privy Seals.

[2] Issue Roll, Mich. 1 Edw. IV, 25th Feb. and 17th March.

[3] Enrolments of Wardrobe Accounts (Exchequer L.T.R.), roll 6, m. 53-54; Issue Roll, Mich. 2 Edw. IV, 11th Feb. and 23rd March.

About the time the king was thus doing honour to his father's memory, his father's friends and fellow sufferers at Wakefield, the Earl of Salisbury and Sir Thomas Neville, were being similarly remembered. By this time Warwick and Montagu, as well as Edward, had ventured to leave the Scottish border, and they in person accompanied the chariot, drawn by six horses, which conveyed the bodies of their father and brother from the temporary resting place in which they had been interred after the battle of Wakefield to Bisham Abbey, an abbey founded by one of their ancestors and mentioned by their father in his will as the place in which he desired to lie after death.[1] At Bisham the funeral cortége was met by the third son of the dead earl, the Bishop of Exeter, chancellor of England, by the earl's son-in-law, Lord Fitzhugh, by the Duke of Clarence, the king's representative, and by many other dignitaries lay and ecclesiastical. Nor were ladies lacking; for as the Countess of Salisbury, who had probably died quite recently, was to be buried with her husband and son, her daughters, Lady Stanley and Lady Margaret of Salisbury, were present, and also her daughter-in-law, Lady Montagu, and the king's sister, the Duchess of Suffolk. The triple interment at Bisham took place on 15th February and, like the ceremony at Fotheringay, was accompanied with all the pomp and magnificence that heraldry could devise.[2]

After the memorial rites at Fotheringay, Edward came down to London, stopping at Hertford Castle and the nunnery of Sion on the way.[3] His loyal London subjects seem to have felt that the capture of the Northumbrian castles justified a sort of triumphal procession, and it was decreed that the mayor and aldermen, in scarlet, and representatives of the livery companies and other citizens, also in gala attire, should ride out to meet him as he drew near and escort him into the city. Edward upset these plans somewhat by deciding to come from Shene by water, but when he arrived, on 24th February, the citizens went forth in their barges and brought him down the river with much display.[4]

---

[1] Dugdale, I, 303.

[2] For a full account of the funeral at Bisham Abbey, see Ordinances and Regulations for the Government of the Royal Household, 131-133. A list of the fees received by the officers of arms on this occasion is preserved in Bodleian MSS., Rawlinson B 146, ff. 20-20b.

[3] Privy Seals.

[4] London Journal 7, ff. 20 and 21b; Sharpe, London and the Kingdom, I, 309.

Though he had come back in triumph, new anxieties awaited Edward in London. The second date set for the assembling of parliament was only eleven days away when he reached the city, but the elections had been proceeding very badly. As the method of electing the knights of the shires in the county courts by the vote of the forty shilling freeholders left many chances open for the sheriff or some neighbouring lord to control the elections by force or other improper means, and also many chances for men who were not entitled to vote to do so notwithstanding, it was too much to hope, especially in these days when the country was hardly yet out of the throes of civil war, that there would not be a good deal of strife and disorder when the parliamentary elections took place. Edward had foreseen trouble, and on the eve of the elections in the county of Norfolk Margaret Paston had written to her husband, at whose own election to parliament two years before not all the proprieties had been observed, that Sir Robert Conyers had shown her a letter from the king desiring him to attend upon the Duke of Suffolk at Norwich on the following Monday "for to be at the election of knights of the shire" and had told her that every gentleman of Norfolk and Suffolk "that are of any reputation" had received similar letters.[1]

But all the king's efforts to keep the elections in the hands of gentlemen of reputation had proved unavailing. The elections had been so generally disorderly that they could not be accepted as legal, and it had been decided that new ones must be held. On the day he spent at Hertford Castle Edward had sent word to the chancellor that, for certain reasons affecting "the politic rule and governance" of the land, he had decided that the first meeting of the parliament should take place at Westminster on 29th April, and had directed that the writs necessary to effect this further change of date and place should be issued.[2] Immediately upon his arrival in London he explained in a proclamation why he had taken this step. He had made the change, he said, partly because the Lenten season, "appropriated to devotion and purifying of every man's life to God's pleasure," was at hand, but also because he understood that in many of the shires the election of knights had "proceeded right inordinately"; and he added a command to all his subjects not to presume, on pain of imprisonment and forfeiture, to come to the election of the knights of the shire unless they were entitled to do so by the possession of a freehold in the shire of the yearly value of forty shillings and, if they were so entitled, to come "in peaceable manner."[1]

---

[1] Paston Letters, IV, 66.
[2] Signed Bills, file 1492, no. 3864.

The second thing the king did after he reached London was not so wise as the issuance of this proclamation insisting that the elections to parliament must be conducted according to the law, and it got him into some trouble. The parliament held at Reading in 1453 had granted to Henry VI a high poll tax on aliens, and nominally this grant was still in force. From the first the Hanseatic merchants had feared that Edward, whom they knew to be in need of money, would be tempted to levy this poll tax, and also the excessive customs duties which had been granted by the Reading parliament but, like the poll tax, had seldom or never been enforced, and when they secured the confirmation of their charters in February, 1462, they had taken pains to obtain a special exemption from the poll tax and the duties as imposed in 1453.[2] These concessions to the Hansards were to endure only until Christmas, 1462, however, and a general protection which was granted to them shortly before Christmas, when it was learned that Cologne and the Hanse towns of the Zuyder-Zee, more friendly to England than those farther east, were sending a couple of ambassadors, was to hold good only until Easter.[3]

The safeconduct for the Hanseatic ambassadors, who were Doctor Johann Frunt of Cologne and Heinrich von Apeltaren of Nimwegen, was issued on 7th December, and the ambassadors arrived in London before Edward came down from the north. Their presence was most fortunate for the Hansards, for on 8th March Edward actually issued commissions for the assessment of the poll tax and the foreign merchants learned, to their consternation and wrath, that every householder among them must pay forty shillings to the king of England and everyone not a householder twenty shillings.[1] Only by great effort did Frunt and Von Apeltaren obtain a new confirmation of all the ancient privileges of the Hanseatic merchants for two years and a half; and even this was granted only on the understanding that within the two years and a half, at a date and place which the Hanse towns must name within a year, a diet was to be held to which all the Hanse towns and Christian, king of Denmark, were to send ambassadors to meet representatives of the king of England and at which a treaty of peace was to be negotiated. Moreover, because Lubeck, which had never forgotten nor forgiven the Earl of Warwick's seizure of her salt fleet in 1458 and other injuries inflicted by the English, was openly opposed to making an agreement with England unless compensation for her injuries was promised, Edward added a proviso that all who showed themselves hostile to him or his subjects, or who endeavoured to prevent the restoration of the old-time peace between England and the Hanse towns, should be excluded from the benefits of his grant.[2]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, no. 3862; Reports touching Dignity of a Peer, IV, 963-965. Some payments made to messengers who distributed the writs of summons are recorded on Issue Roll, Mich. 2 Edw. IV, under the date of 3rd November, although the first writs were not sent out until 22nd December. This is one of many proofs that the dates on the Issue Rolls cannot always be relied on.

[2] Writs of Privy Seal, file 790, no. 837.

[3] French Roll 2 Edw. IV, m. 6; Hanserecesse, II, 5, p. 197; Hansisches Urkundenbuch, VIII, 744. Frunt was in Antwerp at the beginning of November and from there sent a messenger to England to ask for the safeconduct. Hansisches Urkundenbuch, VIII, 740. For the decision to send this embassy to England and the negotiations in regard to it among the Hanse towns—negotiations which illustrate well the discord which was helping to work the ruin of the Hanseatic League—see Hanserecesse, II, 5, p. 121 *et seq.*, p. 194 *et seq.*, and Hansisches Urkundenbuch, VIII, 736.

Thanks to the opportune arrival of their ambassadors, the Hansards had escaped the necessity of paying the poll tax. But the other foreign merchants in England, having no one at hand to plead for them, were not so lucky, and in their helpless anger they seem to have turned on the Londoners, whom they evidently held responsible for the king's act. A sort of local war followed,[3] and peace was not restored until the king gave way and, on 4th June, directed the chancellor to inform the customs officers that all merchants of Genoa, Florence, Venice, and Lucca, and all other merchants and brokers of Italy were exempted for six years, reckoned from the last day of Henry VI's reign, from all subsidies due from them by reason of any act or grant made in the parliament held at Reading. In other words, the Italians were excused from the poll tax and also from all subsidies on wool, woolfells, and tin, except 43*s.* 4*d.* for every sack of wool and every two hundred and forty woolfells and 12*d*. for every twenty shillings' worth of tin, the amounts which native merchants themselves had to pay.[1]

---

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 276-277; London Letter Book L, f. 14. Cf. Hansisches Urkundenbuch, VIII, 755, note 1.

[2] Rymer, XI, 498; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 261; Hanserecesse, II, 5, pp. 197-198, 213-217, 219; Hansisches Urkundenbuch, VIII, 755.

[3] See a letter from the bailli of St. Omer to Antoine de Croy. Waurin, III, 161.

Edward spent two months at Westminster and Windsor. He had discreetly brought the Duke of Somerset with him when he came down from the north, and he was now doing everything he could to "labour himself into forgetfulness" of the past and to win the duke's heart.[2] He made Margaret of Anjou's former favourite his boon companion, even to the extent of sharing his bed with him on many occasions and of sometimes going hunting with him when three out of six of his attendants were the duke's retainers. He even arranged a great tournament at Westminster that Somerset might "see some manner sport of chivalry after his great labour and heaviness. And with great instance the king made him to take harness upon him, and [he] rode in the place, but he would never cope with no man and no man might cope with him, till the king prayed him to be merry and sent him a token. And then he ran full justly and merrily, and his helm was a sorry hat of straw."[3]

The king's sudden friendship for Somerset was not generous enough to include the duke's brother, Edmund Beaufort, who had been a prisoner ever since Geoffrey Gate captured him in the Isle of Wight and who by this time had been transferred from Calais to the Tower of London[4]; but Somerset himself was given a general pardon on 10th March and later, when parliament met, was restored to his "name, state, style, honour, and dignity." He even recovered the lands he had lost through his attainder and was given money by the king to meet his immediate needs. First one hundred pounds, then forty pounds, then ten pounds, then forty marks, then fifty pounds were paid to him at the Exchequer by the king's orders. An annuity of two hundred and twenty pounds was also bestowed on him, and another of £222 4s. 6*d.* on his mother, Eleanor, Duchess of Somerset.[1] To be sure, the annuities were not paid at Easter, when they became due, but Somerset and his mother were by no means the only creditors of King Edward who had to exercise patience.

---

[1] Writs of Privy Seal, file 794, no. 1213. This grant was renewed in February, 1471, and again in July, 1476. Rymer, XI, 696; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 239; III, 2. But the Italians were then required to pay also 10*s*. custom on wool and woolfells and 3*d*. on tin. From the returns from Alien Subsidies (bundle 236, nos. 91, 97, etc.) one would think that the Italians were required to pay the poll tax, but see Guiseppi, Trans. Royal Hist. Society, New Series, IX, 75-98.

[2] Rolls of Parl., V, 511.

[3] Gregory, 219. The wardrobe accounts contain references to a tournament held in Pentecost week. On 1st June a safeconduct was granted to Louis de Brueil of France, coming to England for certain "puncta armorum" with Robert Wingfield. French Roll 3 Edw. IV, m. 9.

[4] See a payment of £18 13*s*. 4*d*. made to Robert Mallory, the Earl of Worcester's lieutenant at the Tower, as the last instalment of the sum of £52 due to him for the maintenance of Edmund Beaufort in the Tower for the space of fifty-one weeks. Issue Roll, Easter 4 Edw. IV, 11th July.

If the king could have kept Sir Ralph Percy as well as Somerset at his side, it would have been well. But Percy had been permitted, according to promise to guard Bamborough and Dunstanborough, and in spite of the readiness he had shown to change sides without giving notice, Edward seems to have trusted him as fully as he trusted Somerset; for on 16th March the king's council decreed that Percy should be given a commission to receive repentant rebels and traitors into the king's grace according to his discretion.[2] Yet almost at the moment this commission was being dispatched to Percy, Margaret of Anjou's French and Scottish friends appeared before Bamborough, and if Percy had not actually invited these visitors, at least he readily allowed both Bamborough and Dunstanborough to fall into their hands.[3]

The loss of Bamborough and Dunstanborough, won so recently and after so much effort, was a bitter surprise as well as a serious blow to Edward and Warwick, who had been flattering themselves since the capture of the Northumbrian castles that their troubles with Margaret were nearly over. They knew that Margaret could do nothing alone, and when her great venture broke down, it seemed a foregone conclusion that those who had shown her only lukewarm friendship before would now desert her altogether. The more likely did this seem because death had just deprived the queen of one of her chief supporters in Scotland, the Earl of Angus, and, with Angus out of the way, the Bishop of St. Andrews's opponents had found new courage to break away from the Lancastrian alliance. Matters had already gone so far that on 14th March Edward had granted a safeconduct for the Earl of Athol and Sir James Stuart.[4]

But in the midst of their regret and chagrin regarding Bamborough and Dunstanborough, Edward and Warwick could find much to console them. For one thing, the Earl of Douglas had recently travelled north to make more trouble for his native land,[1] and with him had gone the Bishop of Down and Connor. By the terms of the treaty signed with them in February, 1462, the Earl of Ross, Donald Ballagh, and John of the Isles had now become Edward's subjects, and during a visit to England the Bishop of Down and Connor had been commissioned to receive their oath and homage.[2] In the second place, there was a brightening prospect of a truce with France. And if Louis should agree to a truce, the Bishop of St. Andrews would have to change his tactics and permit Scotland to do the same.

---

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 261, 263; Rolls of Parl., V, 511; Worcester, 780; Issue Roll, Mich. 2 Edw. IV, 27th Jan. and 23rd March; Warrants for Issues, 3 Edw. IV, 22nd June; Scofield, Eng. Hist. Review, April, 1906, pp. 300-302.

[2] Warrants of the Council, file 1547. Cf. Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 262.

[3] Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 176; Rolls of Parl., V, 511; Fabyan, 653; Gregory, 220.

[4] Rotuli Scotiæ, II, 405.

Evidently the first thought which sprang into the minds of Edward and Warwick after Margaret and Brezé had been chased out of Northumberland was that now was the time to make advances to the king of France. Even before the last of the Northumbrian castles had surrendered, a messenger was on his way to France to announce Edward's desire to send an embassy to treat for an armistice or a long truce, and on 7th January Louis, who had learned several things since the June day on which he signed his treaty with Margaret at Tours, delegated two men to negotiate with the expected English ambassadors. Louis' choice fell on Antoine de Croy, Count of Porcien, a man who was trying to serve the king of France and the Duke of Burgundy at the same time, and Georges Havart, Seigneur de la Rosière, one of the men who had conducted Louis' negotiations with Margaret; and he gave his two commissioners power to arrange not only a truce but a "final peace" with England.[3] In the end, however, no English embassy went to France, probably because before Louis had had time to express his willingness to receive one, Edward began to fear that, if he opened negotiations with France at this moment, he would jeopardize what he had set out to do in Spain.

All the winter through the Dean of St. Severin's, Kent, and Herbert had been in Spain labouring to defeat Louis' schemes and to prevent a personal interview which Louis was very anxious to have with Henry the Impotent. On 26th January Henry appointed the Bishop of Salamanca and others to confer with the English ambassadors at Burgos and with them draw up a treaty of alliance between England and Castile, and he instructed his commissioners to assure the Englishmen that the proposed interview between Louis and himself need cause them no uneasiness, as he had no intention of allowing it to interfere with his negotiations with the king of England.[1] Naturally this message encouraged Edward's ambassadors to believe that Henry really meant to agree to a treaty with England, and their hopes rose the higher because their efforts were being supported by a legate Pius II had sent to Burgos. For Pius was now quarrelling with Louis about the Pragmatic Sanction and was so angry with him that he would not have been sorry to see John of Aragon as well as the king of Castile enter into a league against France.

---

[1] The earl received 100 marks for his expenses, as well as £200 specially assigned to him by the king and his council. Issue Roll, Mich. 2 Edw. IV, 27th Jan. and 14th March.

[2] Rymer, XI, 499; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 262; Signed Bills, file 1492, no. 3874. The Bishop of Down and Connor received a gift of £20 from Edward. Issue Roll, Mich. 2 Edw. IV, 14th March.

[3] Legrand collections, MS. français, 6970, f. 4.

And John of Aragon, as it happened, was quite as willing as Henry the Impotent to treat with Edward. With Louis' help John had made some headway towards crushing the rebellion in Catalonia, but suddenly he found himself in an unpleasant predicament. In the first place, by this time the Catalonians had called in the king of Castile, and as Louis had no intention of letting his alliance with John drag him into a war with France's older ally, Castile, John's French auxiliaries, when they found themselves face to face with the soldiers of Henry the Impotent, stopped short and concluded a truce.[2] In the second place, Louis had found, to John's dismay, an excuse for over-running and taking possession of the whole of Roussillon, and it was only too evident that he meant to treat Cerdagne in the same way. It was not surprising, therefore, that John commenced to think an alliance with Edward would be better than his present alliance with Louis, and that he was ready to listen to what the papal legate told him. He even went so far as to send an envoy, one Rescados, to England, but unfortunately this envoy fell into the hands of the French, and thus the cat was let out of the bag.[3]

---

[1] Calmette, 182, note 2; Daumet, 107.

[2] 13th January, 1463. Calmette, 443; Daumet, 106.

[3] Calmette, 184, note 2; Legeay, I, 312. One who in the English records is called John Dermond, knight, came to England about this time on an embassy from the "king of Sicily" and received a gift of £20 from Edward. Issue Roll, Mich. 2 Edw. IV, 14th March. The title of king of Sicily was borne by John of Aragon but also by his nephew, Ferdinand of Naples. From René of Anjou, a third person calling himself king of Sicily, this ambassador certainly did not come.

The hostility of Pius II, the discovery that John of Aragon was again negotiating with Edward, and the presence of an English embassy at Burgos caused Louis great alarm. In consequence he immediately changed his attitude towards England. As he would far rather sign a treaty with Edward himself than see John of Aragon or Henry the Impotent do so, he became almost more eager for a truce with England than Edward and Warwick were for a truce with him.[1]

Luckily for Louis, Philip of Burgundy, who still aspired to fight the Turks, had lost none of his desire to see France and England at peace with each other and was quite as ready as in the past to act as a go-between. Since, after all, Louis had not displayed any great amount of zeal on behalf of the house of Lancaster and evidently would not hesitate to denounce his treaty with Margaret as soon as he was convinced that it would be to his advantage to do so, Philip saw no reason why a peace between Edward and Louis could not be arranged. Those who were farther-sighted than Philip tried to make him see that such a peace might cause his ruin, as it would free Louis' hands for the task he longed to undertake, the task of bringing the Dukes of Burgundy and Brittany more completely under subjection to the crown of France.[2] But to this warning the duke would not listen. Louis had written to him from Bordeaux that he was willing to hold a conference with the English,[3] and at the end of March Philip sent an embassy to England to make arrangements for a joint meeting of English, French, and Burgundian ambassadors which would provide an opportunity for the negotiation of another extension of the treaty of mercantile intercourse between England and Burgundy as well as of a truce between England and France.

The chief of Philip's embassy, for which Edward granted a safe-conduct on 5th March and which landed in England on the last day of March or the first day of April, was Jean, Seigneur de Lannoy; and the other members of it were Alard de Rabodengues, bailli of St. Omer and captain of Gravelines, Philip de Lowyn, lieutenant of Boulogne, and Pierre de Miraumont, Seigneur de la Boutellerie.[4]

[1] Calmette, 446; Mandrot, Dépêches des ambassadeurs milanais, I, 264.

[2] Chastellain, IV, 493-494.

[3] Legrand collections, MS. français 6970, f. 137.

[4] French Roll 3 Edw. IV, m. 18; Chron. of John Stone, 88; Hist. MSS. Com., Report 9, app., 140. The Seigneur de la Boutellerie is not mentioned in Edward's safeconduct, but for proof that he was a member of Philip's embassy, see both John Stone and Waurin, II, 333.

But Lannoy, although he had been sent as a representative of Philip of Burgundy, could almost equally well be called a representative of the king of France, as he was a nephew of Antoine de Croy, Count of Porcien, and of Jean de Croy, Count of Chimay, both of whom were using their too great influence in Philip's council-chamber according to Louis' pleasure.

As Philip had entertained his ambassadors so magnificently at Valenciennes, Edward now felt called upon to return the compliment, and generous sums were spent for the comfort and pleasure of the Burgundian embassy. Against the coming of the Seigneur de Lannoy and his companions the Earl of Worcester paid out £297 19*s*. 5*d*. ob. for screens and curtains and hangings of silk, for counterpanes of tapestry, linen sheets, and other bed furnishings, and for a gown of crimson cloth of gold in which Edward probably arrayed himself to receive the ambassadors. And during the month of April the clerk of the Greencloth, providing for the entertainment of the same guests, ran up bills with a baker, a grocer, a fishmonger, a pikemonger, a butcher, a woodmonger, a brazier, and a pewterer which amounted to more than forty-five pounds and were not paid for a couple of years. One hundred and twenty pounds were also expended on cloth, woollen and linen, and other stuff "occupied and spent" by the ambassadors, and towards the defraying of their expenses nearly seventy pounds were advanced at the Exchequer to Sir John Fogge and others.[1]

For seven weeks or more the Burgundian ambassadors remained in England enjoying King Edward's "grand chiere," and it is said that during his negotiations with them Edward offered the Seigneur de Lannoy a large bribe but discovered, to his regret, that his chief guest was not to be enticed from the path of honesty.[2] When the ambassadors finally departed for home, Thomas Vaughan escorted them from London to Sandwich, and they carried with them a promise from Edward that he would send an embassy to meet the representatives of the king of France and the Duke of Burgundy at St. Omer on St. John's Day. In France it was hoped that the chancellor of England, and even the Earl of Warwick himself, would come with that embassy.[3]

---

[1] Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 1st March and 11th July; Issue Rolls, Mich. 2 Edw. IV, 14th and 23rd March, and Easter 3 Edw. IV, 8th and 13th May, 23rd June, 23rd August.

[2] Chastellain, IV, 340, 381. Apparently the Burgundian ambassadors were still in England on 19th May. Commynes-Lenglet, II, 400.

[3] Issue Roll, Mich. 2 Edw. IV, 23rd March; Commynes-Lenglet, *ut sup.*

In the meantime, however, something had happened which tended to lessen a little Louis' hurry about securing a truce with Edward. While Philip's ambassadors were in England, Louis had succeeded in obtaining the personal interview with Henry the Impotent which had been postponed from time to time and which the English ambassadors at Burgos had striven so hard to prevent. In other words, Louis' diplomacy had again defeated Edward's. And this time Louis' success enabled him to appear in the amiable and dignified rôle of arbitrator between Henry and John of Aragon. On 23rd April he pronounced his sentence, which was that Henry must restore to John all the places he had seized in Navarre or elsewhere and must also abandon Catalonia to him, while John must grant a certain portion of Navarre to Henry and a general amnesty to the Catalonians if Louis succeeded in inducing them to return to their allegiance to John within three months.[1] After a time it became evident that Louis' triumph was not quite as great as it appeared to be at first, since no one was satisfied with his award, and his Spanish neighbours, some of whom soon discovered that he was hoping to absorb Catalonia into France as he had already absorbed Roussillon and Cerdagne, now trusted him even less than before. But at least it put an end for the time being to the proposed alliance between England and Castile. When the Dean of St. Severin's, Kent, and Herbert returned home on 25th June in a large and well armed ship of Holland, the *Jacob* of Guckhusen, which they had hired in Spain, they brought seventy-six tuns of wine to quench the mighty thirst of their king but, alack! no treaty.[2]

The failure of the embassy he had sent to Spain must have caused sore disappointment to Edward. Yet the king could find some comfort in the thought that, while Louis had again won the game from him in the Spanish peninsula, there was a fairly good prospect that he would ultimately, if not at once, succeed in making offsetting gains in Italy, partly by means of his own direct efforts, but also partly through Louis' quarrel with Pius II. A year since it had occurred to Edward to reward the friendliness the Duke of Milan had shown him with the Garter, though as yet, it seems, the duke had not been notified of his election to the Order; and recently he had decided to bestow the same honour on Sforza's ally, Ferdinand of Naples.[1] On 30th June, consequently, Peter Courtenay was commissioned to go to Milan with the offer of the Garter,[2] while about two weeks later Bartelot de Rivière, a native of Guienne who had fought under the great Talbot and who was still a pensioner of the English crown, was appointed to carry the mantle and Garter to Ferdinand. Moreover, with Rivière, apparently, was to go Thomas, Bishop of Armaghdown, whose destination was the court of Pius II and who was to "solicit unto our said Holy Father certain matters concerning the weal of us and of our land" and to present one hundred marks "by way of reward" to the papal protégé and favourite, Jacopo Ammanati, Cardinal of Pavia.[3]

---

[1] Commynes, I, 138-142; Commynes-Lenglet, II, 378; Calmette, 185 *et seq.*; Daumet, 107-109.

[2] Foreign Roll 3 Edw. IV, no. 97; Writs of Privy Seal, file 794, no. 1250; Customs Accounts, Divers Ports, 194/13; Issue Roll, Easter 3 Edw. IV, 19th July. Although the king told the chancellor to order the customers of the port of London to admit the seventy-six tuns of wine his ambassadors had brought him without payment of custom, subsidy, or prise of any kind, Taster, Kent, and Herbert are charged in the customs accounts with £11 6*s.* 6*d.* as subsidy on seventy-five tuns and one pipe of wine. Herbert seems to have brought home eighteen tuns of wine on his own account, on which he paid 54*s.* as subsidy.

Courtenay must have started for Italy almost as soon as he was given his commissions and instructions, as he was received by the Duke of Milan on 14th September; but Sforza, while expressing himself as much touched by the honour offered him by the king of England, replied that he was afraid to accept it at the present moment, lest by doing so he should give offence to the king of France.[4] Rivière's journey, on the other hand, was delayed for some time, or else he made a very long stay at Naples. For although Ferdinand finally ventured, notwithstanding Louis XI's jealous watchfulness, to accept the Garter, it seems to have been not until the summer of 1464 that he came to this decision. In February, 1465, Rivière stopped at Milan on his way home and was intrusted by Sforza with letters and messages for Edward and Warwick, and it was not until about that time that Ferdinand's acceptance of the Garter became known to Louis, who showed some irritation because Sforza, with whom he was then trying to arrange a marriage alliance, had not dissuaded his friend from accepting it. Louis condescended to be appeased only after the duke's ambassador adroitly reminded him that, at the time the honour was proffered, the king of Naples had every reason to suppose that the king of France looked upon the king of England, not as an enemy, but as a great friend.[1]

---

[1] Beltz, clxiii.

[2] Mandrot, Dépêches des ambassadeurs milanais en France, II, 369, note 1. Courtenay was made Bishop of Exeter in 1478.

[3] Warrants for Issues, 3 Edw. IV, 18th July—two warrants, one of which is printed in Anstis, I, 49, note. In addition to 100 marks for his journey to Naples, Rivière was paid £20 for waiting for the Garter and mantle to be made. Issue Roll, Easter 4 Edw. IV, 11th July. This sounds as if he did not start on his journey at once. Concerning his past history, see Stevenson, Letters and Papers, II, 497-499, and École des Chartes, XXXVIII, 9-10. In February, 1462, Edward had granted him £20 a year from the issues of the duchy of Cornwall. Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 119.

[4] Mandrot, *ut sup.*

As for the Bishop of Armaghdown's mission to Pius II, that probably had to do, first of all, with certain troubles which had developed in the church in Ireland.[2] But the reward of a hundred marks which the bishop was charged to deliver to the Cardinal of Pavia excites the suspicion that Edward was also seeking certain political ends at Rome, and if the immediate results of any attempt which the king of England may have been making at this time to edge his way into papal politics were not important and cannot now be traced, at least a little more good-will stored up at the papal court was an advantage well worth the trouble and expense of winning.

Before they left England Philip of Burgundy's ambassadors had probably looked on with interest and curiosity at the opening of an English parliament. For if the new elections were not carried out with the perfect peace and order the king desired, at least their results were accepted this time, and Edward greeted his second parliament in the Painted Chamber on the appointed day, Friday, 29th April. The text of the chancellor's discourse, "Qui judicatis terram, diligite justitiam," was probably the king's choice, and the Commons presented as their Speaker John Say, a man who had already served in that capacity once before, in 1449, and whose selection must have been highly pleasing to Edward, as Say was a member of his council.[3]

There could be little doubt in anyone's mind why parliament had been summoned. The king must have money. And might he not claim that he had a right to expect a grant from his subjects? Young as he was, he had won victories which have made him for

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 115-116. Malleta, the Milanese ambassador in France, knew as early as July, 1464, that Edward had sent the Garter to Ferdinand, but he did not confide the news to Louis. Mandrot, II, 218, 369.

[2] Rymer, XI, 502.

[3] Rolls of Parl., V, 496-497. For proof that Say was a member of the King's council, see Warrants of the Council, file 1547, 3rd July, 1462. He lived until 12th April, 1478. Inquisitions *post mortem*, 18 Edw. IV, no. 43.

ever famous as a warrior king; since the crown had been his, he had been energetic and, on the whole, successful in defending the kingdom; and he had shown a highly commendable interest in the administration of justice—even going to the length of sitting in person for three days in the court of King's Bench[1]—and a firm determination that the laws of the land should be enforced with thoroughness and impartiality. He had also shown skill in his dealings with friends and foes abroad; he had even succeeded in outwitting Louis XI, past master in craft though Louis already was. He had made some mistakes and done some things he ought not to have done; that was undeniable. For one thing, he had committed the grave fault of taking money from his subjects without waiting for parliament to grant it to him. But money he had to have, and parliamentary grants had all but gone out of fashion. He had only followed in the footsteps of his predecessor when he raised money by "forced loans," and his action had caused no astonishment and less anger, apparently, than ought to have been felt. He had also made very heavy demands on convocation, but seemingly the clergy too had accepted their troubles as inevitable and had felt themselves sufficiently recompensed when, on 2nd November, 1462, they were granted a charter confirming the privileges of the clerical order in England.[2]

Another fault of which the king had been guilty was really less serious than his taxation of his subjects by other than the lawful means, and yet it seems to have disturbed them more. Being rather too amiable and easy-going by nature, he had forgotten some of the advice given to him at the close of the previous parliament and had excited jealous grumbling by bestowing too much of his confidence and too many of his favours on men who deserved less than nothing at his hands. "The commons in this country," one of Paston's acquaintances had written not long after Edward's coronation, "grudge and say how that the king receiveth such of this country, etc., as have been his great enemies and oppressors of the commons, and such as have assisted his Highness be not rewarded; and it is to be considered, or else it will hurt, as me seemeth by reason."[3] The favours which had been heaped on Somerset formed the most flagrant example of Edward's lack of discretion and taste in choosing his friends and distributing his

[1] Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 175; Stow, 416.
[2] Rymer XI, 493-496; Wilkins, Concilia, III, 583-585.
[3] Paston Letters, III, 292. Cf. *ibid.*, IV, 32-33.

rewards, and they might well anger those who had given him their loyal allegiance from the start. But after all, forgiveness was necessary if the wounds of civil war were to be healed. Edward must turn his enemies into friends or struggle with rebellion to the end of his reign, and experience would have to teach him where to trust and where not to trust.

Perhaps Edward could be accused of a third fault, the fault of extravagance, especially in the adornment of his handsome person. For even when his purse was nearly empty, he had been spending large sums of money on jewels and fine raiment.[1] But a resplendent court and a well-dressed king are a source of pride to his subjects even when the bills make them groan, and possibly Edward would not have been as popular as, despite his failings, he undoubtedly was if he had worn shabby clothing such as Louis XI affected. It should also be added that in this matter of extravagance in dress the king was by no means the only sinner. His subjects themselves were immoderately fond of fine clothes. Not only did the nobleman of the day deck himself in costly furs, velvets, and satins and wear shoes with points so long that they had to be tied to his knees with chains or silk laces before he could walk across the room, but the common people, tempted by their growing wealth to ape the nobility, were daily using "excessive and inordinate arrays." Even clerks in holy orders were guilty of wearing garments unsuited to their calling. A petition from the Commons in this very parliament procured a statute which laid down minute regulations as to what persons might wear sables, ermine, and other furs, cloth of gold, "velvet upon velvet," purple silk, damask, and other less expensive materials, and forbade any yeoman or other person under that degree to use bolsters or other "stuffers" in his doublet and any person under the estate of a lord to wear shoes or boots with points more than two inches in length.[1] In this same year, too, convocation found it necessary to decree that no priest or clerk in holy orders should wear any garment which was not closed in front or which was bordered with fur.[2]

---

[1] Proof that Edward had not been stinting himself in the matter of jewels and clothes may be found in Warrants for Issues, 1 Edw. IV, 16th Dec., 7th and 25th Feb., and 2 Edw. IV, 7th March; the Issue Rolls, *passim;* and the Wardrobe Accounts. Between 17th April, 1461, and Michaelmas, 1462, the keeper of the Great Wardrobe expended £4,784 2*s.* 10*d.* ob., thus exceeding his receipts by £1,481 11*s.* 5*d.* ob. qa. But that sum covered many special expenses incident to the coronation, and it must also be borne in mind that the officers of state and of the household got their liveries from the Great Wardrobe. The king's two brothers and his sister Margaret were all clothed at his expense, also, and his mother, and even his two married sisters, the Duchesses of Exeter and Suffolk, received from him gowns of velvet and other rich materials, probably to be worn at his coronation. Between Michaelmas, 1462, and 4th April, 1465, the expenditures at the Great Wardrobe amounted to £5,201 16*s.* 11*d.* qa., which was nearly £200 less than the receipts. Enrolments of Wardrobe Accounts, roll 6, m. 53-55.

But if on the whole Edward deserved well of his subjects and had a right to ask the representatives they had sent to Westminster to grant him the money he needed, he had to wait, as all English kings had to wait, until the Commons had told him what they would expect in return for their grant. And in this instance the principal thing the Commons wanted was remedy of the havoc war had wrought in England's trade and industries. A change of dynasty meant little enough in itself to the average Englishman, but the war which had preceded and attended the last change of dynasty had threatened to bring the wolf to his door. When armies were marching back and forth across the kingdom leaving such devastation behind them as Margaret of Anjou's "northernmen" had wrought, when many of the able-bodied men of the country were receiving call after call to array themselves and come to the support of this king or that, when the sea was infested with pirates who not merely seized England's ships in the open sea but ran into her bays and rivers to plunder her fields and homes, when Calais, through which passed the bulk of England's wool trade, was constantly in danger of falling into the hands of the French, both the home industries of England and her commerce with foreign lands were bound to suffer.

Some of the harm that had been done by civil turmoil parliament now sought to remedy by statutes which, whatever the economists of the present day would think of them, were regarded by those of the fifteenth century as the surest means of enticing prosperity back to the land. England's shipping and her wool trade and cloth trade all came in for a share of attention. She was so far behind her continental neighbours in ship-building that, by the side of the five hundred ton Dutch boat which had brought the Dean of St. Severin's, Kent, and Herbert home from Spain, most English boats (that wonder ship, the *Grace Dieu*, and a few others that William Canynges of Bristol had built being splendid exceptions) looked puny. Evidently the English ship-builder needed help and encouragement and, to put heart into him, it was enacted that no native merchant should make use of a foreign ship when it was possible to procure an English one. At the same time, to give stability to the wool trade, the staple regulations governing it were renewed and native merchants were required, as heretofore, to carry all wool intended for export to Calais, unless it had been grown in Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmoreland, Durham, or certain districts of Yorkshire, in which case it might be shipped at Newcastle for any foreign port. And that the precious metals might flow into the kingdom instead of out of it, the stapler was forbidden to accept for his wares anything but ready payment, one half in English money or else in plate or bullion which must be coined at the mint in Calais and brought to England within three months.

---

[1] Rolls of Parl., V, 504-505; Statute 3 Edw. IV, c. 5.
[2] Wilkins, III, 585-587.

An effort was also made to encourage the manufacture of cloth at home. The Commons complained that, whereas of old English cloth had excelled that of any other country and had been sought by all the realms of Christendom, with the result that every man and woman in England could find an occupation in some branch of the cloth industry, and idleness and the crimes growing out of idleness ceased to exist, now English cloth had lost its reputation and foreign countries, instead of buying it, were shipping large quantities of cloth of their own manufacture into England, where it was sold at excessive prices. To remedy this, the exportation of wool and woolfells from England and Wales by aliens and the importation of woollen cloth, except that made in Wales and Ireland, were prohibited, certain regulations regarding the length, breadth, and quality of broadcloth, "straights," and kersey were laid down, and finally, to induce the workman to do his work better, the clothmaker was required to pay money wages instead of expecting his employes to take a large part of their pay in "pins, girdles, and other unprofitable merchandise," and every carder, spinner, weaver, and other workman was ordered to do his task properly on pain of paying double damages.[1]

In another petition presented by the Commons the silkwomen and throwsters of London complained that their livelihood was endangered and that many young gentlewomen were likely to be thrown out of employment, because Lombards and other aliens were importing wrought silks, ribbons, laces, etc., instead of "silk wool"; and they obtained a statute by which all wrought silks brought into England were made liable to confiscation and every seller of such silks was condemned to pay a fine of ten pounds.[1] The "handcrafty men and women" of England also asked that the importation of a great variety of articles, such as woollen bonnets, ribbons, fringes, thread laces and gold laces, embroidered silk, gloves, purses, girdles, hats, brushes, hammers, daggers, scissors, razors, tennis balls, dice, and playing cards, should be prohibited; and although their petition was similar to, if not a repetition of, the petition "for restraint of certain merchandises" brought to England by the Duke of Burgundy's subjects, which had been presented during the previous parliament, this time Edward did not venture to make his consent dependent upon the Duke of Burgundy's. All that the king did was to add to the desired statute a proviso that it was not to affect the Hanseatic merchants and that it was to continue in force only during his pleasure.[2]

---

[1] Rolls of Parl., V, 501-504, 561-563; Statutes 3 Edw. IV, c. 1, and 4 Edw. IV, c. 1.

Finally, the English farmer sought and obtained relief. The importation of wheat, rye, and barley was forbidden except when the price of wheat exceeded 6*s*. 8*d*. the quarter, that of rye 4*s*. the quarter, and that of barley 3*s*. the quarter—prices high enough to insure to the tiller of the soil a good profit.[3]

When added together, these statutes laid very sweeping restrictions on importations, and they were not likely to please the already irritated foreign merchants. Yet, as if they were not enough, the king added a proclamation prohibiting the importation of wine from Gascony and Guienne.[4] As the best wine, then as now, came from the south of France, this was likely to prove no less of a hardship to the wine consumer who could afford to turn up his nose at the cheaper Rhenish wine which was also consumed in England than to the wine merchant; and certainly Edward himself did not set an example to his subjects by going thirsty. Two years later, for example, when the summer hunting season was approaching, he wrote to Lord Wenlock, chief butler, ordering him to "lay at our trusty and well beloved servant's Nicholas Gaynesford's house beside the Bernes a tun of good Gascon wine that we in our sporting which we make in hunting for the hare at this season may have it ready there for our drinking." He did not even demand that his family and friends should be more abstemious than he was himself. The Duchess of York, learning that she could not be "purveyed for her own drinking of wine of the counties of Gascoigne or Guienne because of an act made upon the same," immediately sought and obtained a license for her butler, factor, or attorney to buy for her, "at this side the sea or beyond the sea," three score tuns of white or red wine from the forbidden districts. And on one occasion Sir John Howard secured permission to import ten tuns of Gascon wine out of Flanders, Holland, Zealand, or Brabant for his household. The king even afforded some relief to the members of his family from his own cellars. When Christmas came, he sent his brothers a gift of two tuns of Gascon wine, and a year later he bestowed on his mother, whose three score tuns were probably exhausted by that time, six tuns of "red wine of Gascony such as [to] her servant shall seem good and according to her mouth."[1]

---

[1] Rolls of Parl., V, 506; Statute 3 Edw. IV, c. 3.

[2] Rolls of Parl., V, 506-508; Statute 3 Edw. IV, c. 4.

[3] Rolls of Parl., V, 504; Statute 3 Edw. IV, c. 2.

[4] See a proclamation of 30th April, 1464, which refers to an earlier one prohibiting the importation of wine from Guienne. Close Roll 4 Edw. IV, m. 13. Stow states that in this parliament of 1463 it was ordained that no "tunner" of London should sell Gascon wine, "white, claret, or red," for more than 8*d*. a gallon. The city of London had decreed on 30th April that red wine should sell for 10*d*. a gallon. London Journal 7, f. 26.

Parliament had been in session only a month when again alarming news was received from the north. On the last day of May London learned that Sir Ralph Grey had turned traitor. For some reason Grey had felt resentful because Alnwick Castle was intrusted, after its fall, to Sir John Ashley instead of to him, and as soon as an opportunity offered he followed the example of Sir Ralph Percy. Henry, Margaret, and Brezé seem to have arrived at Bamborough about this time with some reinforcements, and probably it was their coming which gave Grey the courage to declare for the house of Lancaster. Ashley was turned out of Alnwick—to fall into Percy's hands and be given over to the French—and then Grey opened the gates to Lord Hungerford and a remnant of Margaret's little French army.[2] It was the story of Bamborough and Dunstanborough over again.

As a report that Grey had designs on Newcastle accompanied the news of his betrayal of Alnwick, it was decided that Montagu, who had just been made warden of the east march,[1] should hurry to the help of that town and that Warwick should follow him as soon as he could get ready to do so. Montagu started off at once, therefore, but he had scarcely lost sight of London when more encouraging news arrived. It was now learned that King Henry's men had been defeated in a skirmish before Newcastle and that out of several French boats which were carrying supplies to Bamborough four of the largest, including a carvel belonging to the Count of Eu, had been captured. But in spite of this, Warwick and Lord Stanley left for the north on 3rd June with a large force, and the understanding was that Lord Scales would join them shortly.[2]

---

[1] Exchequer Accounts, Butlerage, bundle 82, no. 10; Writs of Privy Seal, file 795, no. 1281; Manners and Household Expenses of England in the Thirteenth and Fifteenth Centuries, 187.

[2] Waurin, III, 159-160; Worcester, 781-782; Gregory, 220; Warkworth, 38. In December, 1464, Ashley was evidently trying to raise money to pay his ransom, as Edward granted him 500 marks at that time for his more speedy release. Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 379.

Meanwhile Grey's treachery had one good result, for it spurred the Commons to give the king the money he wanted. But the grant that was announced when, on 17th June, parliament was prorogued until 4th November was a somewhat novel one. Breaking away from the form in which it had been customary for more than a century to make grants to the crown, the Commons offered the king an aid of thirty-seven thousand pounds. Thirty-one thousand pounds, the amount representing the value of a fifteenth and tenth after the usual deduction of six thousand pounds for decayed towns had been made, was to be levied as a fifteenth and tenth would be levied, except that no person not owning landed property or rents of a yearly value of ten shillings, or goods and chattels of a yearly value of five marks, was to be taxed ; and one half of the thirty-one thousand pounds was to be paid in at the Exchequer of Receipt on the feast of St. Peter ad Vincula (1st August), the other half on the feast of St. Martin in Winter (11th November). The remaining six thousand pounds, which represented the customary deduction for decayed towns and was to be charged after the rate of that deduction as made from the last fifteenth and tenth, was to be levied in every shire and every town incorporated as a shire on all inhabitants having landed property or rents of a yearly value of twenty shillings or goods and chattels of a yearly value of ten marks; and the whole six thousand pounds was to be paid in at the Exchequer of Receipt simultaneously with the first half of the thirty-one thousand pounds.[1]

---

[1] Rymer, XI, 500 ; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 426. See also Warrants for Issues, 3 Edw. IV, 30th May, where, curiously enough, Montagu is styled Earl of Northumberland, although that title did not belong to him until 27th May, 1464. Cf. an article by C. S. Perceval, "On Certain Inaccuracies in the Ordinary Accounts of the Early Years of the Reign of King Edward IV," in Archæologia, XLVII, where attention is called to the fact that Montagu is given the title of Earl of Northumberland in a commission issued the day before his elevation to that dignity. That he should be given that title a whole year before he had a right to it is still more remarkable. One must conclude that the warrant of 30th May, 1463, remained in the form of a memorandum until after 27th May, 1464, and that when it was finally engrossed the clerk carelessly gave Montagu his later title.

[2] Waurin, *ut sup.* A payment of £550 to Montagu for his journey to the north is entered on Issue Roll, Easter 3 Edw. IV, under the date of 4th August. £100 of this money had been borrowed from his brother, the chancellor. Warrants for Issues, 3 Edw. IV, 9th August.

The grant was a generous one, but it was for one purpose only. The king was distinctly told that the money was to be used for the hasty defence of the realm against "your and our mortal enemies" and for no other purpose whatsoever.

[1] Rolls of Parl., V, 497-498.

CHAPTER VIII

THE ST. OMER DIET: QUEEN MARGARET'S SECOND DISAPPOINTMENT

WHEN Warwick hurried after Montagu to Northumberland, he did not expect to be detained there long, as he knew that none of the Northumbrian castles were victualled for a siege at the time they were handed over to Henry and Margaret[1] and as the likelihood that Margaret would be able to obtain further help from Scotland seemed small. Scotland, indeed, appeared to be on the verge of civil war, and all signs pointed to the victory of the party which was in favour of peace with England. Although the Earl of Athol and Sir James Stuart had made no use of the safeconduct they had secured in March, fresh advances had evidently been made to Edward, as the day after the news of the fall of Alnwick was received a safeconduct was granted to Duncan of Dundas, one of the Scots who had spent some weeks in London in the summer of 1461; eleven days later a new one was granted for Athol and Stuart, and on 25th June still another for the Bishop of Aberdeen and eight other Scots.[2] And when it was learned that Lord Hailes had succeeded in wresting the boy king of Scotland from the hands of the Bishop of St. Andrews, there seemed to be every reason why Edward and Warwick should rejoice. For Hailes was reputed to be the accepted lover of Mary of Gueldres, and as he and his confederates offered to ally themselves with the Earl of Douglas, it was natural to conclude not only that the queen mother had at last triumphed over Kennedy, but that she meant to follow up her triumph by signing the truce with England which she had always been disposed to favour.[3]

But Warwick had not been in Northumberland many days before he was undeceived in regard to the situation in Scotland. Even after Hailes's abduction of the king, the Bishop of St. Andrews still kept the upper hand, and though James's subjects were now openly clamouring for peace with England, the reinforcements which Henry, Margaret, and Brezé had taken to Bamborough probably consisted largely of Scots furnished by Kennedy.

---

[1] Waurin, *ut sup.*

[2] Rotuli Scotiæ, II, 408; Rymer, XI, 502, 504.

[3] Waurin, III, 163; Hume Brown, Hist. of Scotland, I, 255, note.

The Bishop of St. Andrews's persistent loyalty to the house of Lancaster was the more remarkable, and the more exasperating to his opponents, because by this time no one who did not wilfully shut his eyes to the truth could fail to see both that the king of France had practically abandoned Henry and Margaret to their fate and that there was slight prospect of their receiving aid from any other source. In February or March Louis Destin, one of Brezé's men-at-arms, had been sent to the Duke of Brittany with letters,[1] but neither men nor funds were to be obtained from Francis. Somewhat later Guillaume Cousinot, Seigneur de Montreuil, a man who had shared in Brezé's raid on Sandwich and who was now Louis' chamberlain, had come to Scotland, but neither by Cousinot nor by anyone else did Louis offer anything more helpful than kind messages. For Louis had learned the need of caution, and when, in May, he ventured to send a servant of the Seigneur de la Barde to England to ask the Earl of Warwick for a greyhound, the information that servant picked up for him did not incline him to commit any more rash acts.[2] As Cousinot was returning to France at the end of June, he stopped at Bruges and, through the Hanseatic merchants there, made an appeal on Henry's behalf to the Hanse towns, of whose differences with Edward Margaret had heard. Cousinot promised that, if the Hansards would supply Henry with men, money, and weapons, the king would confirm and enlarge their privileges in England when he recovered his throne. But here too Margaret failed, as the Hanse towns were now laying plans for the diet with England which had been suggested by the Zuyder-Zee towns and were looking forward to a favourable settlement with Edward.[3]

As soon as Warwick reached Northumberland and got some understanding of the actual state of affairs in Scotland, he realised that the recovery of the Northumbrian castles was not going to be the easy task he had thought, and he sent warnings to London, dispatched the Earl of Douglas to the west marches to make raids across the border, and then hurried back to Yorkshire to raise more men. On 11th July he wrote to the Archbishop of York from Middleham that the Scots had entered England "with great puissance" and charged him to array his clergy as quickly as possible and send them to Durham.[1] In the meantime Edward, stirred by Warwick's letters, decided to go north again himself and to send the Earl of Worcester along the coast with a fleet.[2] Ships were fitted out as speedily as possible, therefore, and Sir Henry Bellingham, who had been a prisoner in the Tower probably ever since the capture of Naworth Castle by Lord Montagu and now expressed a wish to earn the king's forgiveness by doing "faithful and true service" under the Earl of Worcester, was set free to take part in the expedition.[3] On 5th July the king demanded from the officers of the Exchequer five thousand pounds of the money received from the first half of the aid granted by parliament that he might use it for the defence of the realm "in this our progress toward the north parties"; and the next day he gave orders that Worcester should have £4,680 for the keeping of the sea, appealed to convocation, which had just convened at St. Paul's, for more money, and then set out for Northumberland.[4]

---

[1] Morice, III, 66.

[2] Lettres de Louis XI, II, 117-118. English dogs, particularly greyhounds, enjoyed a high reputation at this time. See Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 147. The Dukes of Burgundy had six "valets de chiens anglois et de chiens d'Artois" among their many officers and servants of the chase. Curne de Sainte-Palaye, Mém. sur l'ancienne chevalerie (Paris, 1826), II, 286.

[3] Hanserecesse, II, 5, pp. 248-253.

Among the noblemen who left London with the king was the Duke of Somerset, of whose loyalty Edward still had so little doubt that he had recently given orders for the payment of his annuity[5] and, as if to invite treachery, had even made him captain of his bodyguard. But "the guard of him," exclaims Gregory, "was as men should put a lamb among wolves of malicious beasts," and evidently so thought the men of Northampton. For when the citizens of Northampton beheld Margaret of Anjou's friend come riding into their town by the king's side, they rose in wrath and tried to kill him under the king's very roof. It was with great difficulty that Edward saved the duke's life and, fearing that another time he might not succeed so well, he hurried his friend off to some castle, apparently in Wales, and sent his men, his own late body-guard, to Newcastle. Then he gave the good people of Northampton a tun of wine with which to make merry in the market place and trusted that the incident would be forgotten.[1]

---

[1] Raine, Priory of Hexham, I, cvii-cviii.

[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 281, 301, 302; Warrants for Issues, 3 Edw. IV, 5th and 24th July; Fabyan, 653; Kingsford's London Chron., 178. On 24th June Worcester surrendered the office of treasurer to Lord Grey of Ruthyn. Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 286.

[3] Writs of Privy Seal, file 795, no. 1262; Close Roll 3 Edw. IV, m. 21. At the time Montagu took Naworth, it was reported that he had captured and beheaded Bellingham. Paston Letters, IV, 51.

[4] Warrants for Issues, 3 Edw. IV, 5th and 6th July; Wake, 377; Waurin, III, 162.

[5] Warrants for Issues, 3 Edw. IV, 22nd June.

Perhaps the ire of the Northampton men had been the more quickly excited by the sight of Somerset basking in the king's favour because word had just come that the queen with whom he, and his father before him, had been so intimately associated had crossed the Tweed with an army of Scots and laid siege to Norham Castle. On 15th July letters both from Edward and from Warwick telling of the attack on Norham were laid before convocation, and so grave did the news sound that not only were the clergy moved to grant the king the tenth he had asked for, but the common council of London made an offering of five hundred marks for the victualling of the army going to Scotland.[2]

The siege of Norham is said to have lasted eighteen days, but it was raised before Edward left Northampton by Warwick and Montagu, who not only put the Scots to flight, but pursued them some distance into their own country.[3] Margaret and her son fled, too, and it seems to have been on this occasion that they had the blood-curdling adventure which Margaret afterwards recounted to Philip of Burgundy's sister, the Duchess of Bourbon. As they were fleeing from their enemies, according to Margaret's story, they fell into the hands of a band of thieves, who not only robbed the queen of her jewels but threatened to kill her. With his sword in his hand, the leader of the thieves seized the queen by her clothing, and though she threw herself on her knees and wept and begged for mercy, her life would probably have ended then and there had it not happened that at that instant her captors fell to quarrelling over their spoils. Seeing that she was forgotten for the moment, Margaret glanced about for a chance to escape, and noticing among the thieves a youth with a kindly countenance, she ran up to him and besought him to help her. Fortunately the youth's face was a true index of his heart and, touched by the queen's appeal, he leapt upon his horse, placed the queen in front of him and her son behind him, and then galloped away with them into the forest. To the frightened queen every tree they passed looked like a robber with a drawn sword, and after a time they did encounter another brigand, and one of a mien so fierce and altogether terrifying that they gave themselves up for lost. But lo! this awful person turned out to be as kind-hearted as the youthful thief; for when the queen entreated him to spare her son if not herself, he threw himself at her feet and swore that he would rather die a thousand deaths than fail to convey her son to a place of safety. So it came about that, escorted by the kind youth and the kind brigand, Margaret and her son reached Berwick with their lives, though without their jewels.[1]

---

[1] Gregory, 221-222.

[2] Wilkins, III, 585-587; London Journal 7, f. 37.

[3] Gregory, 220. Cf. a letter from Lord Hastings to the Seigneur de Lannoy in Legrand collections, MS. français 6970, f. 361. (See Appendix I.).

The failure of the attempt against Norham Castle ended the danger of further losses in Northumberland, and from Northampton Edward went to Fotheringay to rest and enjoy himself. But if Margaret had met with another check in the field, at least she had accomplished one of her aims; for she had hindered the meeting of English, French, and Burgundian ambassadors at St. Omer on St. John's Day and had postponed, if not averted, the signing of a truce between Edward and Louis.

Louis had been looking forward to the St. Omer diet with the greatest eagerness, because it promised to give him not only the truce with England which he had come strongly to desire, but also an opportunity to meet the powerful earl who was reputed to be the real ruler of England. Having early learned that such connections often proved to be of great use, Louis XI always strove, both openly and secretly, to make as many friends as he could among other princes' subjects.[2] Thanks to such friends, there were times when he probably knew more about what was going on in the territories of some of his neighbours than did the rulers of those territories themselves; and so important did he consider such information that, to win the good-will of those who could supply it, he spared neither flattery, which cost him nothing, nor money, which in general he was not very ready to part with. The shallow morality of the age made practices of this kind easy, and Louis was not the only monarch who employed them. Edward himself had tried to bribe the Seigneur de Lannoy, and though he met with disappointment in that instance, there were other cases in which his money was not refused. But Louis carried the friend-purchasing custom farther than any of his contemporaries. If there were few men who, if adroitly approached, could not be bought, there were none at all whom Louis dared not try to buy, and the man of all men whom he most wished to get into his clutches was the Earl of Warwick.

---

[1] Chastellain, IV, 299-306. Cf. Du Clercq, liv. V, c.i, and Commynes-Lenglet, II, 178. There is a cave about two miles from Hexham which is known as Queen Margaret's Cave, and according to local tradition, this was the retreat of the brigand and there the queen rested for a time under his protection. See W. S. Gibson, Notices of Some Remarkable Northumbrian Castles, etc., 85. But as Margaret was making for Berwick, it is most unlikely that she passed near Hexham.

[2] Commynes, I, 73.

It was not likely that Warwick could be bought with money, since he already had money in abundance. But was he proof against flattery—that delicate flattery which Louis knew so well how to use? Louis hoped not. Apparently the earl had already shown himself to be approachable, as Louis had ventured to send to him for a dog; and if only he would come to St. Omer, Louis meant to meet him there and exert his subtlest wiles. The mouth of the spider was already watering at the thought of that luscious fly!

Louis again named Antoine de Croy to treat with the English for him, and Croy's instructions were ready fully ten days before the date set for the diet. No one doubted that the English ambassadors would come, for Lord Wenlock had written to Croy's nephew, Lannoy, that there would be "nulle rupture" on England's part, that Edward's commissioners would be on hand at the appointed time, and that Warwick would be one of them. Philip of Burgundy, who had the success of the diet so much at heart that he was planning to attend it in person, sent orders to St. Omer to have lodgings made ready both for the French and for the English embassies, and he asked Croy to write to the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Louis d'Harcourt, Bishop of Bayeux, and the admiral of France, Jean, Seigneur de Montaubon, who, with Croy, were to act for Louis, to tell them to be at St. Omer by St. John's Day or soon after.[1]

---

[1] Legrand collections, MS. français 6970, f. 137. Antonio de Noceta reported to the Duke of Milan on 27th May that Louis was going to send the Seigneur de Croy, the admiral of France, and Étienne Chevalier to England to negotiate a truce with the help of the Duke of Burgundy, and this news he confirmed in another letter, written on 11th June, when he added that, if the truce was obtained, Louis meant, it was said, to turn his arms against Germany in an

On 19th June one Jean Piercon, who had been sent to England to make inquiries, returned to St. Omer bringing word of Grey's betrayal of Alnwick and of Warwick's hasty departure for the north of England; but he also stated that Warwick did not expect to be in the north long and that he fully intended to come to St. Omer. The other members of Edward's embassy, Piercon was able to add, would be Warwick's brother, the chancellor of England, the Earl of Essex, Lord Hastings, Lord Wenlock, Sir Walter Blount, treasurer of Calais, Sir John Clay, Doctor Thomas Wynterbourne, and Louis Galet; and a pursuivant of Lord Wenlock, he declared, was even then on the point of crossing the sea to get the necessary safeconduct. This was good news, and at Piercon's request the bailli of St. Omer, Alard de Rabodengues, immediately wrote it all to Croy.[1]

But it turned out, as we know, that Warwick found more to do in the north than he had anticipated. Consequently when St. John's Day came, there were no English ambassadors at St. Omer. It was still thought, however, that they would come soon, and Croy, from his castle of Porcien, wrote to Louis on St. John's Day, forwarding to him the bailli of St. Omer's letter of 19th June and telling him that on the following Saturday (29th June) he would go to Rouen and remain there until the English and Burgundian envoys had reached St. Omer, as it was more fitting, he thought, that he, who represented the king of France, should arrive after the other ambassadors than before them.[2]

Nevertheless, the Englishmen still failed to appear, and on 3rd July the admiral of France wrote from Caen that on the preceding Friday a small armed carvel of England had been seized and that the men in it declared that King Henry had entered England with twenty thousand men and captured five or six places, that the Earl of Warwick had departed from London with a large army, and that all the ships of England had been arrested and were being victualled, though whether to go to France or to Scotland they could not say.

---

effort to conquer the left bank of the Rhine. Mandrot, Dépêches des ambassadeurs milanais, I, 275, 281. But Louis' ambassadors were not to go to England, but to St. Omer. And in the end, apparently, the Patriarch of Jerusalem took the place of Étienne Chevalier in the embassy.

[1] Waurin, III, 159.

[2] Legrand collections, MS. français 6970, ff. 207-208. Croy also wrote that the English "feront assez diligence de parsemer au regard du Duc de Sommerset, dont en nosd. lettres en est une clause." Apparently he was referring to something in Louis' instructions to him which related to Somerset.

Only the day before, the admiral added, eight or nine English ships of war had wanted to land at Barfleur but had been driven off by the men he had stationed there.[1] By this time Croy, who had grown tired of waiting at Rouen, had gone to Arras and thence to Boulogne; and from Boulogne he wrote on 7th July to the Patriarch of Jerusalem that, while he was at Arras, he had learned that the English ambassadors were at Sandwich and passage to Calais arranged for them, but that Thomas Vaughan had brought word to the Duke of Burgundy that King Edward dared not let them proceed, because it was reported that the French king and his "compaignons" were collecting a large fleet and that some French ships were hovering about Calais.[2]

As a matter of fact, Edward had commissioned—not Warwick, since he was far too busy with Margaret and the Scots to leave England—but Warwick's brother, the chancellor, the Earl of Essex, Lord Wenlock, the Dean of St. Severin's, Thomas Kent, Thomas Wynterbourne, Henry Sharp, Sir Walter Blount, Louis Galet, and Richard Whetehill to represent him at St. Omer; but just as these ambassadors were ready to start on their way, it was noised abroad that a French fleet was assembling and, soon after, that Calais was about to be besieged.[3] Edward trusted Louis too little not to fear that there might be some truth in these rumours, and although he gave orders, just before he left London for the north, that those who had been appointed to go to St. Omer should be paid in advance for forty days' service,[4] the ambassadors remained in England, while a hurried effort was made to pay up arrears of wages at Calais once more.

Again the merchants of the staple had to help out at Calais. This time they advanced a quarter's wages, £3,436 3*s.* 8*d.*, for the garrison in return for a grant of that amount out of the second half of the aid just granted by parliament, while at the same time Blount, as treasurer of Calais, and John Wode, as victualler of Calais, were given sufficient assignments on the same half of the aid to insure the payment of another quarter's wages, due since 2nd June.[1] In addition Blount received twenty thousand pounds, half in assignments on the aid and half in assignments on the grant which was expected from convocation, on the understanding that the money was to be spent in the purchase of wool and woolfells which were to be shipped to Calais at the king's "aventure" and there sold for the purpose of raising money to pay such arrears of wages and rewards as had been due at Calais, Guines, and Hammes on the last day of the reign of Henry VI.[2] The king's council then appointed the Earl of Essex, Wenlock, Wode, and others to "take reckoning" with those to whom money had been due on the last day of Henry's reign—except that in the case of Hammes the reckoning was to be extended to 25th October, 1461, probably the last day before the castle submitted to Edward—and when these commissioners brought in their report, which was not until 10th December, 1464, it showed that the crown's indebtedness at the three fortresses amounted to £37,160 4*s.* 10*d.* q^a. The Earl of Warwick himself was a creditor to the amount of more than thirty-five hundred pounds; his father, the late Earl of Salisbury, to more than five hundred pounds; Sir Walter Blount to nearly forty-eight hundred pounds, and Richard Whetehill to more than twelve hundred pounds, while John Brown, "cook," presented a bill of nearly thirty-two pounds for services at Calais and another of over twelve pounds for services at Guines.[3] No wonder there was always danger of mutiny at Calais!

---

[1] Legrand collections, MS. français 6970, f. 318. Cf. a document in Commynes-Dupont, II, 317-318, note.

[2] *Ibid.*, f. 319.

[3] Paston Letters, IV, 78.

[4] Rymer, XI, 504; Issue Roll, Easter 3 Edw. IV, 23rd July. The chancellor was to have £200, Essex £133 6*s.* 8*d.*, Wenlock £80, the Dean of St. Severin's, Kent, Wynterbourne, Sharp, and Blount £40 each, and Galet and Whetehill £26 13*s.* 4*d.* each.

The fright about a French attack on Calais proved to be groundless, but meanwhile more time had been lost at St. Omer. However, on Saturday, 15th July, one Philippe de Cran[4] wrote to Croy from Boulogne that that day a fisherman had returned from England bringing with him a man who was clerk to Richard Whetehill and who declared that on the following Monday, without fail, Whetehill, Blount, and "Ourselay"[1] would arrive at Calais to make preparations for the coming of the St. Omer embassy, which would leave London for Sandwich on that same day.[2] But Whetehill's clerk also reported that Warwick was now in Newcastle and would not stop until he had entered Scotland, and that King Edward was about to follow the earl with a large army. From this it was evident that Warwick himself would not be with the embassy. While that was a great disappointment, Croy, who was now at St. Omer, was much relieved to hear that someone would soon arrive to negotiate with him, and he sent copies of Cran's letter to Louis, to the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and to the admiral of France, adding the information that the Duke of Burgundy had come to Hesdin to be ready for the diet and that the duke's council, of which the writer himself was the most influential member, had been at St. Omer for the past eight days.[3]

---

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 271; Warrants for Issues, 3 Edw. IV, 2nd July. Cf. Issue Roll, Easter 3 Edw. IV, 7th, 9th, and 13th July.

[2] Warrants for Issues, 3 Edw. IV., 1st July. Cf. French Roll 3 Edw. IV, m. 11 and 15; Issue Roll, Easter 3 Edw. IV, 7th July, 18th August; Foreign Roll 4 Edw. IV, m. A.

[3] Warrants of the Council, file 1547, 8th July, 1463; Warrants for Issues, 3 Edw. IV, 15th July; French Roll 3 Edw. IV, m. 3; Chancery Miscellanea, bundle 2, no. 50. The commissioners also reported that extensive repairs were needed at the three fortresses and suggested that it would be wise to increase the stores of artillery and other habiliments of war kept there.

[4] Mlle. Dupont gives the name in this way, but Croy, in his letter to the Patriarch of Jerusalem, speaks of him as Philippe de Loven, "lieutenant du seneschal du Boullenois," evidently meaning Philippe de Lowyn, who had been a member of the Burgundian embassy sent to England in the spring.

Edward's ambassadors did leave London at the beginning of August, for on the third day of that month they arrived at Canterbury.[4] Three days later Croy was writing to Louis from Hesdin that he had word that the English ambassadors had been expected at Calais on the preceding Thursday (4th August), if the wind was favourable, and on the following day at Guines, where the lieutenant had been making great preparations for their reception. From Guines, Croy said, they would come to St. Omer, and then he thought the diet would soon be over, as both parties fully understood the purpose for which it had been arranged. The Duke of Burgundy, he also said, would go to Boulogne to meet the Englishmen when they arrived, and he himself would accompany him.[5] And yet on 15th August the English ambassadors were still at Canterbury,[6] and in the meantime Philip, who had left Hesdin on the 10th to accompany his sister on a pilgrimage to Boulogne, had been informed that they wanted a new safeconduct and had received letters from Warwick in which the earl stated that it would be impossible for him to leave England for six weeks or two months to come.[7]

[1] Probably Otto Worsley. Croy spells the name in the same way. The name of Whetehill's clerk is given as Colin Herevé.

[2] Waurin, III, 162-164.

[3] Legrand collections, MS. français 6970, f. 331. This letter was written at St. Omer on 19th July.

[4] Chron. of John Stone, 88.

[5] Legrand collections, MS. français 6970, f. 358.

[6] Chron. of John Stone, 89.

[7] See a letter from the Patriarch of Jerusalem to Louis XI which was written at Thérouanne on 14th August. Legrand collections, MS. français 6970, f. 365.

Close upon the heels of Warwick's letter to Philip came one from Lord Hastings to the Seigneur de Lannoy, who had evidently made many friends while he was in England. Hastings wrote on 7th August from Fotheringay, whither he had gone with Edward from Northampton, and his letter was full of boasting about what Warwick had accomplished in the north. The English ambassadors, he wrote, would be ready to go to St. Omer shortly, where, indeed, they would have been before now had it not been for "la grande entreprise" of the king's ancient enemies, the Scots, in league with his great traitors and rebels, Henry, calling himself king, and Margaret, his wife, against the castle of Norham. The king of Scotland, he said, assisted by the queen of Scotland and the said Margaret, had laid siege to that castle with all the might of his kingdom, and they had told themselves that fear of their "grande severité" would enable them to conquer the noble realm of England. But one English knight, "le noble et vaillant seigneur, Monsieur le Comte de Warwick, subjet de mon souverain seigneur," with only the men of the marches to help him, had raised the siege, scared the king of Scotland and his army into flight and Margaret and her captain, Pierre de Brezé, into betaking themselves across the sea without attempting to land, while all the time King Edward, quite undisturbed, amused himself with the chase. The king of Scotland and his army had not only been put to flight, Hastings went on to say, but they had been pursued into their own territory, where the countryside had been laid waste, many fortresses destroyed, and many Scots killed. In fact, it had been "la plus grande journée" against England's old foes of the north that had been made for many years, and Hastings himself had no doubt that those foes now repented, and would go on repenting till the Judgment Day, the favour and aid they had given to Henry and Margaret. "Et combien que leurdite repentance n'est ignoré toute parfaite," he concluded, "j'espére que de brief elle prendra tel effect et conclusion que sera à memorance à la perpetuelle desolation et misère de la nation des Ecossois, à la grace de Dieu."[1]

Hastings was right when he said that Margaret and Brezé had gone across the sea, but it was a superfluous piece of information to send to Lannoy, who was probably surer of the fact than Hastings himself. For Margaret had gone across the sea in the hope of breaking up the St. Omer diet, which her attack on Norham had served to delay for some weeks; and this time she had set out to seek an interview, not with the king of France, who had played her false, but with her enemy of other days, Philip of Burgundy. She had " ne credence, ne argent, ne meubles, ne joyaux pour engaiger " —not even such clothing as a queen should wear—but she did have a safeconduct which Philip had given her on some occasion.[1] Hoping that this would protect her, she sailed from Bamborough about the end of July. She was content to leave Henry at Edinburgh, as she knew he would be safe under the Bishop of St. Andrews's care, but she took her son with her, as she had done the year before, and also a considerable company of friends, including Brezé, to whom she was now indebted for the very bread she ate,[2] the Duke of Exeter, Sir John Fortescue, Sir Edmund Mountfort, Sir Robert Whitingham, Doctor Morton, Doctor Mackerell, and seven women attendants.[3]

---

[1] Legrand collections, MS. français 6970, f. 361. (See Appendix I).

Margaret sailed straight for Sluys, and as soon as she arrived there, she sent Jean Carbonnel, the man who had been Brezé's lieutenant in the isle of Jersey, to Philip to announce her arrival and to beg him to name a place where she could meet him. But while Margaret's forlorn condition did not fail to touch Philip's chivalrous heart, she had come—as she meant to—at a very awkward moment, and Philip did not propose to let his pity for her jeopardize the success of the St. Omer diet, which now at last seemed about to take place. He sent his chamberlain, Philippe Pot, to Sluys to extend courteous greetings to his unexpected and unwelcome guest, but he did not encourage her to hope for an interview. Pot entreated the queen not to think ill of the duke because he did not hasten to meet her; the negotiations about to begin at St. Omer made it necessary that he should stay near that place. On the other hand, she must not think of attempting to go to him, she was told, for Boulogne, whither the duke was now bound with the Duchess of Bourbon, was dangerously near Calais and, furthermore, great numbers of Englishmen had just come to St. Omer. As she had suffered quite enough already, she ought not to run the risk of being captured by her enemies.[4]

---

[1] Chastellain, IV, 279-280.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Worcester, 781. According to Worcester, Margaret made her journey to Flanders in April. This is certainly incorrect, and yet it was reported on the continent in April that she and her son had returned to her father. See the letter of Antonio de Noceta already cited. Calmette, 446.

[4] Chastellain, IV, 280-282.

But Margaret was not to be put off. Pot wrote to Philip from Sluys that the queen was ready to meet him wherever he might be, and she sent another messenger who overtook the duke at Montreuil on 12th August. King Henry had told her, she wrote, to speak with the duke face to face, and for no consideration would she disobey her husband's command. She seemed to be determined, Croy wrote to the Patriarch of Jerusalem, to be present at the St. Omer diet and spoil everything.[1] And this was, of course, exactly what Margaret was seeking to do. But Philip had already divined her purpose and was on his guard.

Philip must have stretched the truth somewhat when he told Margaret that many Englishmen had already arrived at St. Omer, for in reality nothing had yet been seen of Edward's ambassadors. On 13th August Philip received letters from the treasurer of Calais saying that the ambassadors were ready to come and that a large number of ships, some of them ships of war, were waiting to convey them across the sea, but that they were delaying their departure a little in order that others—perhaps the Earl of Warwick himself, who, it was said, was now with the king—might join them.[2] All hope of Warwick's coming, however, was doomed to disappointment. On 21st August Edward met his ambassadors at Dover, and in the Great Chamber of Dover Priory the chancellor, in as much as he was about to leave the kingdom, delivered the great seal to William Morland, clerk, that he might bear it back to London and give it into the custody of Robert Kirkham, keeper of the rolls of Chancery.[3] Immediately after, the ambassadors bound for St. Omer at last crossed to Calais under the protection of the Earl of Worcester's fleet.[4] But Warwick was not with them.

Even when they reached Calais, the English ambassadors were afraid to go on to St. Omer until they had received assurance from the Duke of Burgundy that they had nothing to fear from the king of France. Wenlock rode over to Boulogne on 24th August and was received by Philip with much cordiality. The duke declared, according to his own report written to Louis on the same day, that he would answer for the safety of King Edward's ambassadors "de mon corps et de mes biens," while Jean de Croy, speaking for Louis, asserted that not a man in Louis' kingdom would dare do aught to offend them. Thus reassured, Wenlock returned to his colleagues at Calais on the following day and told them that all was well and that before Sunday Philip would send the Seigneur de Lannoy and the Seigneur de Rabodengues to conduct them to St. Omer on Monday.[1]

---

[1] See a letter written by Croy at Samer on 13th August. Legrand collections, MS. français 6970, f. 364. Compare the speeches which Chastellain (IV, 282-283) puts into Margaret's mouth.

[2] Croy's letter.

[3] Rymer, XI, 506-507. Cf. Writs of Privy Seal, file 795, no. 1260.

[4] Worcester was paid £100 for the passage of the ambassadors to Calais. Issue Roll, Easter 3 Edw. IV, 23rd August.

It looked now as if the very last obstacle to the diet had been removed, and Philip wrote to Louis that he hoped the negotiations would result in " quelque bon fruit pour la prosperité," as it appeared from what Wenlock had said that the English ambassadors had come prepared to be liberal and conciliatory. But there was one stumbling-block still in the way, and that stumbling-block was Margaret of Anjou. Just at this moment, on the advice of Pot, who had been deeply moved by her distress and her courage, Margaret sent word to Philip that she was coming to see him and, without giving the duke time to reply, started on her journey.

Afraid to take risks for her son, though she stopped at none for herself, Margaret left the Prince at Bruges and, disguised as a simple village woman, set out with Brezé and three of her women attendants in a common village cart. As she was nearing Lille, she was met and welcomed by the Count of Charolais, who not only entertained her royally during her short stay in the town, but loaned her five hundred crowns.[2] At Bethune some Englishmen were lying in wait for her, but as by this time Philip had resigned himself to the interview it seemed impossible to ward off and had sent some archers to act as a guard for her, she escaped that danger ; and on the last day of August she reached St. Pol. There she waited for Philip, who had sent a message begging her to remain in the first suitable stopping place she found, and there the duke came to see her two days later.

On hearing that Philip had arrived, Margaret hastened into the street to meet him, and both in the first greetings and during the interview which followed each strove to outdo the other in courtesy and cordiality. When Margaret and Brezé endeavoured to convince him that those who had told him that Margaret of Anjou and her husband were his enemies had slandered them falsely, Philip replied, probably with more politeness than truth, that he had not believed all that he had been told; but his thoughts were at St. Omer, and he cut the interview as short as he could. That evening Margaret and Brezé supped in splendour with the duke and his noble company, and again there was a great display of cordiality; but Philip spent only one night at St. Pol, and though before he went away he promised Margaret that he would keep her wishes in mind and that nothing prejudicial to her should be done at St. Omer if he could prevent it, he reminded her that the king of France would share in the responsibility for the results of the negotiations. Margaret wept as she bade the duke good-bye and thanked him for his kindness, and after Philip had departed for Hesdin and ridden some distance on his way, he sent back two thousand crowns and a costly diamond for her, one hundred crowns for each of her women, five hundred crowns for Brezé, and two hundred for Jean Carbonnel. His last thoughtful attention was to send the Duchess of Bourbon and her daughters to St. Pol to comfort the unfortunate queen.

---

[1] See Philip's letter to Louis, which is printed in Plancher, Histoire générale et particulière de Bourgogne, IV, ccxli, and a letter written on the same day by Antoine de Croy to Louis, which is to be found in Legrand collections, MS. français 6970, f. 374.

[2] According to Chastellain, Margaret's first meeting with the Count of Charolais took place at Bruges. But Du Clercq's narrative is fuller at this point.

Margaret and Brezé dined with the Duchess of Bourbon on 2nd September, and it was then that Margaret poured into the ears of this sympathetic listener the story of her misfortunes and adventures. But the next day the duchess and her daughters went back to Hesdin, and Margaret herself then returned to Bruges. Philip's archers again accompanied the queen to protect her from the English, and at Bruges she was received, by Philip's orders, with great respect. Gifts were presented to her, and also to her son; and the Count of Charolais, his brother, Anthony, Bastard of Burgundy, and other knights who had gathered there for a tournament exerted themselves to the utmost to do her honour. The Count of Charolais insisted on paying her and the Prince all the deference that would have been due to them had King Henry been in possession of his kingdom, and Margaret and Brezé, on their side, made a laudable effort to bring about a better feeling between the count and his father. Charles, being quite unaware that, in spite of his violent opposition to the transaction, his father was on the point of selling to Louis XI the Somme towns which had been ceded to him by Charles VII, seemed not unwilling to listen to friendly counsel, and while Margaret went from Bruges to Nancy to visit her father, Brezé proceeded to Hesdin to thank Philip for his gifts to the queen and himself and to convey to him Charles's dutiful promises.[1]

During Philip's absence at St. Pol the negotiations at St. Omer had begun, and begun so well that on the first day of September the Seigneur de Croy wrote optimistic letters to Louis.[2] But Philip's attentions to Margaret had probably nettled, if not alarmed, the English ambassadors, for they now insisted that Louis must promise that he would have nothing whatever to do with Henry and Margaret. They would hear of no compromise whatever, and for several weeks it seemed as if the diet which Philip had thought would proceed so smoothly was going to collapse. The Englishmen declared that it was only to please the Duke of Burgundy that their king had consented to treat with the French at all, and they found fault with Philip himself because he was not present in person while the negotiations were going on. Messengers were constantly hurrying from St. Omer to Hesdin, where Philip stayed after his return from St. Pol, to get advice from the duke, and Philip was kept busy soothing ruffled feelings and removing other difficulties. He explained that he could not leave Hesdin because the king of France had sent word that he was coming to meet him there, and the Englishmen, whose tempers were somewhat sweetened by a very splendid banquet given by the Seigneur de Lannoy, could only accept the excuse. But it was finally decided that as Philip could not come to the English ambassadors, the English ambassadors should go to him. Louis reached Hesdin on 28th September and two days later the chancellor of England and his colleagues also arrived there.

When Edward's ambassadors were presented to Philip, the chancellor delivered an address in Latin, "moult élégante" and replete with compliments, to which Philip caused a modest reply to be made expressing his desire to be of assistance to King Edward and his gratification that so distinguished an embassy had been sent to St. Omer in response to his request. But after this good beginning the Englishmen proved as intractable as before. Louis, who always preferred to conduct his negotiations himself when he could, had come to Hesdin not only to persuade Philip to sell the Somme towns to him, but also because he still hoped that, if the

---

[1] Chastellain, IV, 284-332, 350-356; Du Clercq, liv. V, c.i; Commynes-Lenglet, II, 178; Gachard, Itinéraire de Philippe le Bon, 90; Gilliodts-van-Severen, V, 521-522, 532-535; Worcester, 781.

[2] Mandrot, Dépêches des ambassadeurs milanais, I, 289.

Earl of Warwick had not already come to the diet, he would do so soon.[1] But Warwick had not come to the diet, and was not going to come, and Philip found it no easy matter to induce the English ambassadors who had come to consent to enter the presence of "King Louis," as they persisted in calling the king of France. At last, however, on 3rd October, when the Englishmen stopped at the chateau to thank the duke for another magnificent banquet which he himself had spread in their honour in the park, he cleverly succeeded in bringing Louis and them together. It was a master stroke, as Louis was graciousness itself, shook hands with the chief members of the embassy, and made himself as agreeable as possible. The Bishop of Exeter improvised another brief but tactful speech in Latin, and then Louis asked the ambassadors many questions, declared in a loud voice that he wished well to their king, whom he described as a "gentil prince," and practically confessed his willingness to renounce the cause of the house of Lancaster.[2]

Louis' intimation that he was ready to abandon Henry and Margaret was all that Edward's ambassadors wanted, and a few days after the meeting at the chateau the negotiations which had been dragging on for more than a month came to a happy end. On 8th October a truce between England and France was agreed on, and in this truce the territories of the Duke of Burgundy, and also those of the Duke of Brittany, were included. For Francis could not be left out, although he had recently excited Louis' suspicion by some negotiations with Edward arising out of the seizure of a party of English pilgrims at Treguier and a retaliatory seizure by the English of some Breton pilgrims bound for the same shrine.[3] But the truce applied merely to the land, not to the sea, and was for a year only. It was the understanding, however, that in the following spring, on 21st April, another diet was to be held at St. Omer to negotiate a longer truce.[4]

Before the diet broke up, the commercial treaty between England and Burgundy was also continued until All Saints' Day, 1464, and the Englishmen seem to have held out the hope to Philip that Edward would send some good English archers for his expedition against the Turks. Louis definitely promised six thousand men for the crusade.[1]

---

[1] See a letter which Louis wrote to the Count of Charolais three years later. Lettres de Louis XI, III, 90.

[2] Chastellain, IV, 337-340, 373-389.

[3] Lettres de Louis XI, II, 150-151, 163-164; X, 206; Bibl. de l'École des Chartes, série II, tome III, 233-244.

[4] Rymer, XI, 520; Lettres de Louis XI, *ut sup.*

One other subject had been broached at Hesdin. According to a story which came to the ears of a Milanese envoy at Lyons, the English ambassadors requested Louis to give the hand of his daughter to their king. But Louis, in spite of his strong desire to arrive at a good understanding with Edward, was not prepared to do that. He replied that his daughter was too young to be Edward's wife—which was certainly true, as Anne of France had been born about the time Edward ascended the throne—and offered one of his wife's sisters, a daughter of the Duke of Savoy, in her place.[2] Another bride also seems to have been suggested to Edward, to wit, one of the daughters of the Count of Foix; and there is reason to think that negotiations looking to this marriage were actually begun. But they did not proceed far, as the Duke of Alençon, whose own daughter the Duke of York had once sought as a wife for Edward and who was now again in treasonable communication with the English, managed in some way to put an end to them.[3]

On 10th October the English ambassadors left Hesdin to return to Calais. Louis had given Thomas Vaughan a considerable sum of money to distribute among certain persons at Guines and Calais who had been robbed by a party of Frenchmen,[4] and Philip had not allowed a single Englishman to depart without a gift. The Bishop of Exeter, who had greatly pleased Philip by offering to accompany him on his crusade with three hundred men, had been presented with two beautifully wrought flagons. All the other members of the embassy had received pieces of plate, silks, or other articles of value, and generous largesses had been distributed among the minstrels, heralds, and servants.[5] By 25th October the ambassadors were in London again, and on that day Kirkham returned the great seal to the chancellor at his house in the parish of St. Clement Danes. The next day announcement was made of the prorogation of the intercourse of merchandise with Burgundy, and on the 27th the truce with France was proclaimed.[1]

---

[1] Rymer, XI, 507; Du Clercq, liv. V, c.vii; Perret, I, 417.

[2] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 109; Mandrot, Dépêches des ambassadeurs milanais, I, 299-300.

[3] Procès de Jean II, Duc d'Alençon, printed in Archives curieuses de l'histoire de France depuis Louis XI jusqu'à Louis XVIII (Paris, 1834), 139-157. Cf. a letter written from Paris on 25th October by some ambassadors from the city of Barcelona. Calmette, 485.

[4] Legrand's history, MS. français 6961, f. 556. Apparently this did not prevent the English from taking revenge by seizing some Frenchmen. Cal. Milanese Papers, *ut sup.*

[5] Chastellain, IV, 389-390; Laborde, Les Ducs de Bourgogne, études sur les lettres, les arts, et l'industrie pendant le XV^{e} siècle, etc. (Paris, 1849-1852), I, 481.

The king, the proclamation stated, has concluded with his cousin and adversary, Louis of France, an abstinence of war on land which is to begin for Calais, Guines, and Hammes on 20th October and for all his other possessions on 15th November, and which is to endure till the going down of the sun on the first day of October, 1464. During that time, it has been agreed, neither party shall make war on the other, nor permit his subjects to do so; and though the said abstinence does not extend to the sea, the merchants of both parties are to have safeconducts, if it is the pleasure of the king of England and the said Louis to grant them. Further, Louis of France shall neither give, nor suffer his subjects to give, any help or favour to Henry, late calling himself king of England, Margaret, his wife, nor her son,[2] nor to any other enemies of the king of England; and similarly the king of England shall not give, or suffer his subjects to give, any help or favour to the enemies of Louis of France.

So the worst that Margaret had feared had come to pass. The king of France had definitely deserted her and her husband to make peace with their enemies. No longer could they hope to receive from Louis even such poor help as he had given them in the past. And that was not all. Louis' desertion too surely meant that the already tottering support of Scotland—Scotland, which had been their refuge—would also be withdrawn from them. Even the Bishop of St. Andrews would lose courage now. And in fact, even before it was known in Scotland that a truce had been signed between Edward and Louis, Kennedy's troubles had reached a crisis which made his surrender inevitable.

When Edward returned to London after seeing his ambassadors start for St. Omer, it was to complete preparations for a vigorous campaign against Scotland. Neither he nor Warwick was satisfied with the punishment that had been dealt out to Scotland after the siege of Norham was raised, and even while he was at Fotheringay, idling and amusing himself, as Hastings had written to Lannoy, the king had been laying plans with Warwick to teach the Scots a severer lesson. Again Edward meant to share in whatever fighting might take place, and before he left Fotheringay for

---

[1] Rymer, XI, 507-509.

[2] Note the care that is taken to describe the Prince as *her* son, not *their* son.

Dover, his plans were so far advanced that he wrote to the mayor of Salisbury that he expected to be at Newcastle on 13th September "toward our voyage against our enemies of Scotland," and asked the mayor to send men to meet him there on that day.[1] Even the journey to Dover was not allowed to delay his preparations. As he was passing through London on his way to Dover, he gave orders that fifteen hundred marks should be paid to those appointed to secure certain supplies which were to be sent by sea to Scotland "for victualling of us and our people purposing, with the grace of God, towards the same at this time"; and a few days after his return to London he was on his way to the north again.[2]

Dark indeed were the clouds that hung over James III's kingdom at this moment. What with James's youth and the quarrelling among his advisers, what with the raids the Earl of Douglas was again making across the border, and what with the more serious invasion that threatened from England, it looked, as the Bishop of St. Andrews afterwards complained to the king of France, as if Scotland were "en voye de perdicion." Kennedy, who was blamed for everything, felt that his very life was in danger because he had stood in the way of peace with England, and during Margaret's absence poor King Henry became so frightened that, at his own request, the bishop sent him first to St. Andrews, later to some place on the coast, and finally to his friends at Bamborough.[3] Kennedy even made up his mind that, despite his calling, he would have to gird on a sword and take the field in person, so desperate had the situation become. But just at the crucial moment Scotland had a piece of good luck. The Earl of Douglas was seriously defeated and his brother, Douglas of Balveny, and many other of his accomplices were captured, hurried to Edinburgh, and there executed.[4]

---

[1] Hatcher, Old and New Sarum, 158. Just before this letter from Edward, Hatcher prints another, dated Nottingham, 20th June, in which the king asks the mayor of Salisbury to send men to meet him at Doncaster on 1st August. But Edward was not at Nottingham on 20th June, 1463, or on 20th June in any other year of his reign. The letter was probably written at Northampton instead of at Nottingham, and on 20th July instead of on 20th June.

[2] Warrants for Issues, 3 Edw. IV, 20th August; Privy Seals. The king was at York by 13th September, and he spent the four following months in Yorkshire.

[3] Instructions to Monypenny, Waurin, III, 169-172. The bishop did not say to what place in England he sent Henry, but it must have been to Bamborough, as there is proof of Henry's presence there on 8th December, 1463. Archæologia, XLVIII, 190.

[4] Waurin, III, 173; Chronicle printed in Pinkerton's Hist. of Scotland, I, 503.

Douglas's disaster put a check on the English invasion of Scotland. But it did not quiet James's subjects, and immediately after came reports of the truce between Edward and Louis. In that truce Louis had not included Scotland in any way, and though the Bishop of St. Andrews had just been relieved by death of his chief opponent, Mary of Gueldres,[1] he decided to give up the struggle he had maintained so long and open negotiations with Warwick, "conduiseur du royaume d'Angleterre dessoubz le roy Edouart," as he described the earl.

On 3rd December Edward, who had been staying at Pontefract for some time past, rode to York, and two days later he granted a safeconduct for a Scottish embassy.[2] The Bishop of St. Andrews, the Bishop of Glasgow, the Earl of Argyle, and Lord Levinston were among those who were named in the safeconduct, but Kennedy himself did not actually come to York. That was more than he could bring himself to do. A sufficient number of envoys appeared, however, and the negotiations lasted only a few days. The Earl of Douglas was again a difficulty, but the Scots seem to have been satisfied when Edward offered to send him off to Ireland to serve as warden of Cragfergus Castle, and on 9th December a truce, and also an agreement that other representatives of the two kingdoms should meet at Newcastle on 6th March for further negotiations, was signed. On land the truce was to begin on 16th December, on the sea on 1st February, and both on land and on sea it was to continue until the last day of October, 1464.[3]

Bitter indeed was the pill which the Bishop of St. Andrews had been forced to swallow. But had the whole truth been told, he might have found a little consolation in the discovery that he had held out long enough to cause Edward IV some trouble with his subjects and Louis XI a disappointment.

Edward's subjects had "groched sore" because the aid granted by parliament in the spring exceeded the customary fifteenth and tenth; and even the clergy had begun to murmur and complain at the burdens laid upon them. A subsidy of 13*s.* 4*d.* had been required from all stipendiary priests in the province of Canterbury whose stipends amounted to ten marks, and this tax was regarded as a great hardship, as the stipendiary priests were poor.[1] If the money which the king had been granted had been well spent, if great things had been accomplished during the summer's campaign, probably all of the grumbling would have died quickly away. But to the eyes of the people the campaign had looked much like a farce, as the king himself had gone no farther than Yorkshire and the Earl of Worcester's fleet had merely hugged the shore and, when its provisions were consumed, returned home.[2] The feeling against the king rose to such a pitch that something had to be done to mollify his critics. On 4th November, when parliament met at Westminster, Edward was still at York and the Archbishop of Canterbury announced an adjournment until 20th February, at York. But before the members went their many ways the Commons obtained a renunciation by the absent king of six thousand pounds of the aid—in other words, a renunciation of the amount by which the aid exceeded a fifteenth and tenth—and also a promise from him that the remaining thirty-one thousand pounds should be levied as a fifteenth and that the payment of the second half of the aid should be postponed until 25th March.[3] Certainly it was with no glad heart that Edward made these sacrifices.

---

[1] Her death probably took place on 1st December. Exchequer Rolls of Scotland, VII, lv.

[2] Rymer, XI, 509; Household Accounts, Accounts etc. (Exchequer K. R.), bundle 411, no. 13.

[3] Rymer, XI, 510-511; Rotuli Scotiæ, II, 409; Waurin, III, 174. Cf. Ramsay, II, 301.

The disappointment which Louis XI suffered, and which the Bishop of St. Andrews might have told himself that he was responsible for, was that a second time he lost a chance to meet the Earl of Warwick. About the beginning of November Louis received letters from Warwick announcing that he would be at Calais by the end of the month without fail;[4] but as it was not until the beginning of December that the truce with Scotland became a certainty, the earl was again kept on the Scottish border longer than he had anticipated and his intended visit to Calais had to be given up.

---

[1] Warkworth, 3; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 177.

[2] Three Fif. Cent. Chron., *ut sup.*; Gregory, 221.

[3] Rolls of Parl., V, 498-499.

[4] Lettres de Louis XI, X, 206. The editor has assigned this letter of Louis' to the end of October, but it seems to belong more properly to the beginning of November.

CHAPTER IX

THE OVERTHROW OF SOMERSET, PERCY, AND GREY

AT the close of the year 1463 the cause of the house of Lancaster looked hopeless indeed. Yet there were three castles in Northumberland and one in North Wales which were still defying Edward, and in other parts of the kingdom, too, Henry VI had enough friends even now to be a menace to peace and order, if nothing worse. For not only had some English hearts never wavered in their allegiance to Henry, but others which Edward had succeeded in seducing returned soon to their first love. For example, at the moment that the ambassadors of James III were signing the truce with Edward which seemed to deprive Henry and Margaret of their last hope of assistance, Henry welcomed back to his side at Bamborough a man whose friendship Edward had done his utmost to win. Notwithstanding all the favours that had been showered upon him, the Duke of Somerset "stole out of Wales with a privy many" and spurred his horse towards Northumberland.

Somerset's first object was to get possession of Newcastle, as the men Edward had sent to that town after the unpleasant incident at Northampton were really his servants and they had undertaken to hand the place over to him as soon as he arrived. While he was passing through Durham, however, someone recognized him and he was all but captured in his bed. Luck was on his side for the moment, as he escaped "in his shirt and barefoot," but two of his men were taken, and also his "casket and his harness"; and although, as he fled northward, he seems to have given warning to his accomplices in Newcastle, several of them were caught and beheaded. After that, thoroughly alarmed, and probably also thoroughly ashamed because he had allowed Somerset to trick him so easily, Edward sent "a great fellowship of his household men" to Newcastle and made Lord Scrope of Bolton captain of the town. But in the meantime Somerset had reached Bamborough in safety.[1]

---

[1] Gregory, 223. Cf. Rolls of Parl., V, 511.

Somerset's flight must have occurred before 20th December, as on that date all his castles, lordships, etc., were granted to the Duke of Gloucester. And a payment of fifty marks which was made to the Earl of Worcester's lieutenant at the Tower on 5th December for the keeping of Edmund Beaufort may have been suggested by the news of Somerset's treachery and a feeling that additional care in the guarding of his brother was advisable.[1] Even the duke's mother was now arrested and placed "in ward," where, to judge from her own story, she soon began to feel the pinch of poverty, as not only did the annuity which Edward had granted to her remain unpaid, but her tenants, taking her arrest "for an imprisonment" and saying "that they will know who shall be their lord or lady first," refused to pay their rents, with the result that she was "like to have perished for lack of sustenance, had not divers persons of their very pity and tenderness relieved and comforted her."[2]

Either before or soon after Somerset reached Bamborough, two other old friends rejoined King Henry there. Sir Henry Bellingham, who had won his freedom by offering to serve under the Earl of Worcester at sea, had probably participated in Worcester's fruitless cruise along the coast during the summer, but at some moment he had found a chance to escape and, seizing it, had fled as fast as he could to Bamborough.[3] The other newcomer at Bamborough had also been Edward's prisoner. Perhaps because he was of kin to the Earl of Warwick, Humphrey Neville of Brancepeth had been treated very leniently after his capture in the summer of 1461. Within a few months after he was taken it must have been rumoured that he was going to be released, as on 26th October, 1461, the Prior of Durham wrote an anxious letter to the chancellor of England saying that Humphrey Neville had been "a cummerouse man" to him and his brother and beseeching the chancellor, in case Humphrey was coming again to that neighbourhood "to have liberty and rule as he had before," to see that he did them no harm.[4] The anxiety of the prior and his brother was needless, as Neville was attainted shortly after the prior's letter was written, and although in February, 1462, he was pardoned all executions against him on account of his attainder and granted his life, it was on the understanding that he would remain in prison during the king's pleasure. A little later, however, he escaped from the Tower, fled to Northumberland, and there "made commotion of people," and in April, 1463, a commission for his arrest was issued. But again the king relented. On 3rd June, 1463, Lord Montagu and Sir James Strangways were empowered to receive the culprit into the king's grace, and on 21st June he was given a pardon for all offences, including his escape from the Tower, his attainder was reversed, and his possessions were restored to him. Yet after all this Humphrey Neville fled again sometime during the winter of 1463-1464, and this time he found his way to King Henry at Bamborough.[1]

---

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 292; Issue Roll, Easter 4 Edw. IV, 11th July. Somerset's brother John was probably in Harlech Castle at this time. Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 355.

[2] Signed Bills, file 1494, no. 3953; Scofield, Eng. Hist. Review, April, 1906, pp. 301-302.

[3] There is no means of determining the exact date of Bellingham's flight, but he was with the Lancastrians in the spring of 1464. Rolls of Parl., *ut sup.*

[4] Raine, Priory of Hexham, I, ciii-civ.

Somerset, Bellingham, and Humphrey Neville had all had plenty of reason to feel uncomfortable in Edward's service, but they would not have fled to Henry had they not been convinced that he still stood a good chance to recover the throne. Nor is it very surprising if these men still believed in the ultimate victory of the house of Lancaster, since that of the house of York was evidently proving a great disappointment. Edward's accession had by no means brought all the good things which his friends and advocates had promised, and partly on that account and partly, perhaps, because grumbling had become a habit, there was always a sufficient amount of discontent among his subjects to feed the hopes of his enemies. The Englishmen whose boat had been seized when Louis was so anxious to know whether Warwick was coming to St. Omer had expressed the opinion that the people of England had been happier and less heavily taxed under Henry than under Edward, and that they would gladly receive Henry back again were it not for the oath they had given to Edward and the fear they felt of him and of the Earl of Warwick.[2] And though Lord Hastings wrote boastfully to Lannoy of the equanimity with which Edward devoted his time to the chase while Warwick raised sieges and drove the Scots home, many of the king's subjects felt, as the fault-finding at the end of the summer's campaign proved, that he would have been much more suitably employed in helping the earl. Edward had left London so many times with the announced intention of crushing his enemies and afterwards come back without seeing a battlefield that not a few people had begun to suspect that he found a campaign in the north too convenient an excuse for demanding money from his subjects.

---

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 122, 267, 269, 279; Rolls of Parl., *ut sup*. Neville was at Bamborough by 1st April, 1464, if not earlier.

[2] Waurin, II, 318, note.

Of course Edward's "evil-willers" listened eagerly to every word of complaint that was uttered against him, and Somerset especially had been watching and listening for signs of discontent all the time he had been living so intimately with the king. Indeed, the duke had been doing much more than watch and listen; he had been plotting far and wide. For to say nothing of the plan he had laid to seize Newcastle, when he arrived at Bamborough he brought Henry the assurance that seventeen of the chief men of Wales, and many other persons in the south and west of England, had given their oath to rise on his behalf.[1] The duke was convinced that with only a little help from outside Henry could be made king again and that, in spite of the truce between Edward and Louis, and in spite of the Bishop of St. Andrews's unwilling surrender to Warwick, that help could still be found somewhere. The king of France might change his mind about Edward and Warwick when he heard how large a following the house of Lancaster still had in England and, even without Louis, the house of Lancaster had two very valuable friends in the Duke of Brittany and the Count of Charolais. With Francis and Charles Queen Margaret, who was still with her father, could easily get into communication, and Somerset probably surmised, if he did not actually know, that the queen was already besieging them for help. In fact, not long after Somerset reached Bamborough two men, one of whom was a servant of the Duke of Exeter, arrived there with letters from Margaret in which she informed her husband that she had had good news from the Duke of Brittany and the Count of Charolais, who were in close alliance with each other and were determined to do all they could to assist him. And soon after came a messenger from the Count of Charolais himself with letters "bien gracieuses et confortatives" and the assurance that the count would ever uphold the cause of the house of Lancaster. Some Bretons who arrived in Scotland about this time brought word, too, that their duke was King Henry's firm friend and announced that he had instructed them to give the king any of their merchandise he might desire.[2]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, III, 179.
[2] *Ibid.*

These proofs of the good-will of the Duke of Brittany and the Count of Charolais were very encouraging, but what was better still was the little inclination the king of France showed to remember and live up to his promise to Edward to give no aid or favour to Henry and Margaret. For another person who arrived at Bamborough was Guillaume Cousinot, and when he recrossed the sea in February, he was laden with many messages from Henry to Louis, to Margaret, to the king and queen of Sicily (René of Anjou and his wife), to the Duke of Brittany and, in all probability, to the Count of Charolais. Henry signed Cousinot's instructions at Bamborough on 22nd February, and copies of some of them—unfortunately not including those which were to guide him when he talked with the king of France—have been preserved.[1]

To Queen Margaret, to whom he was to go as soon as he had seen Louis, Cousinot was to carry word of the promises of help which Somerset had brought from England and Wales, and he was to urge her to try to accomplish three things in her negotiations with the Duke of Brittany and the Count of Charolais. First, she was to endeavour to have Henry made a third party in the existing league between Francis and Charles, if she had not already brought that to pass. Second, she was to ask her father and the Duke of Brittany and the Count of Charolais to persuade all the lords of France to petition Louis not to sign a truce or treaty with Edward.[2] Third, she was to beseech the Count of Charolais to send some artillery or food to Bamborough, and René of Anjou to send some gunners and culverines, and from some source she was to procure "un peu d'argent" for Henry's adherents at Bamborough and other places. The queen was also asked to entreat the Duke of

---

[1] When Mlle. Dupont discovered the undated memorandum made by Cousinot of what he was to tell Margaret and printed it in her edition of Waurin's chronicle (III, 178-181), she decided that it belonged to the summer of 1462, when Margaret made her first journey to the continent. And all subsequent writers have accepted her decision. But that the memorandum belongs properly to the year 1464 is proved by two other portions of Cousinot's instructions of which copies are preserved in Legrand's collections, MS. français 6978, ff. 69-72. (See Appendix II). In these collections the instructions are placed among the documents of the year 1471, but it is obvious that they do not belong there; and in his history Legrand himself attributes them to 1464. See MS. français 6960, f. 617. In fact, they must belong to 1464, as they were signed by Henry at Bamborough on 22nd February, and in no year except 1464 was Henry at Bamborough in February and Margaret on the Continent.

[2] Evidently Cousinot had brought word that there was to be a second St. Omer diet.

Brittany, as Cousinot himself was to do, to send the Earl of Pembroke to Wales with an army, if it was an army of not more than a thousand or even five hundred men; and she was told to assure Francis, when making her request, that the moment Edward was attacked at both ends of England, the people would rise up everywhere to replace Henry on the throne.[1]

To René of Anjou Cousinot was to express, first of all, Henry's deep gratitude for the " bon et grand vouloir " which his father-in-law had always manifested towards him and his affairs and for the kindness he had shown to Queen Margaret and the Prince of Wales during their visits to him. Then he was to give René all the news he could about Henry and about England and tell him that, since every day Henry received messages from his subjects in all parts of his kingdom urging him to make a demonstration of some sort, it was evident that, with a little assistance in the shape of men, money, and artillery, he could recover his entire kingdom in a short time. Indeed, the people of England, Cousinot was to declare, now favoured Henry entirely, while they regarded Edward and his adherents with such a mortal hatred that " c'est estrange chose d'en ouyr parler de tous costez." It seemed, therefore, that René ought to see the wisdom both of sending help himself and of persuading the king of France to do likewise, in order that Henry might be enabled to regain his throne and " the Earl of March " and his followers be prevented in the meantime from conquering the places which now adhered to Henry and which they were planning to besiege in the coming summer.

To the Duke of Brittany Cousinot was to convey Henry's thanks for the kind welcome he had given Margaret at the time she visited his duchy, for the presents he had made to her and her attendants, and for all the other civilities he had shown her. He was also to express Henry's thanks for the good-will the duke had evinced towards himself since the queen's visit and for his expenditures on his behalf—kindnesses for which the king felt himself under deep obligations and in return for which he would not fail, if it was God's pleasure that he should recover his kingdom, to bear himself towards the duke in a way that would make him rejoice. But when these polite messages had been delivered, Cousinot was to tell Francis also how much England longed for Henry and that if only the king could have a little help sent to him either in

---

[1] Waurin, III, 178-181.

Northumberland or in Wales, the whole country would instantly rise for his sake. Just a little help in men and money was all that he needed, but that help he could not get where he was, and meanwhile, as anyone could see, he was in personal danger, a fact which ought to excite the pity of all princes, especially of those princes who were his kinsmen and friends. It was hoped, therefore, that the duke would send the king immediately some supplies, such as wheat, malt, wine, and salt, and also some iron, powder, and artillery, and that later, as soon as he could, he would send, either directly to the king or, if that was impossible, to Wales with the Earl of Pembroke, a " bon numbre " of men paid for half a year's service, and also some money. Henry's commissioners, Cousinot was to say, would arrange satisfactory terms with the duke, insuring him proper recompense, and all agreements made with him or his men the king would accept and ratify.[1]

Doubtless the picture Cousinot was to paint of England's discontent with Edward and longing for the return of Henry was too highly coloured, and yet the effect of Somerset's work had become so apparent even before Cousinot left Bamborough that the picture took on a look of truth. For Somerset's flight to Northumberland had been followed almost at once by disturbances on the Welsh border which were so serious that Edward not only dispatched the Duke of Norfolk to Denbighshire as quickly as possible, but hurried westward himself.

In the latter part of January John Paston was told that the two chief justices, Markham and Danby, and Master Thomas Lyttleton were " awaiting upon the king, for the king is purposed into Gloucestershire " ; and not long after Edward rode from Coventry to Worcester at such speed that he covered the whole distance within twenty-four hours.[2] After two days at Worcester Edward went to Tewkesbury, and from 4th to 10th February he was at Gloucester. There were a number of hangings and beheadings, and the " great *oyer* and *terminer* in our county of Gloucester " kept the chief justices away from Westminster for eighteen days. But the king probably did not stay to see the end of the work in Gloucestershire, for by 15th February he was hurrying to Cambridgeshire to punish other "risers against the peace," and it was said that he intended to visit other counties as well.[1]

---

[1] MS. français 6978, ff. 69-72.

[2] Paston Letters, IV, 88 ; Household Accounts, Accounts, etc (Exchequer K.R.), bundle 411, no. 13.

While the king was busy in Gloucestershire and Cambridgeshire, the Duke of Norfolk was finding plenty to do in Denbighshire. About the middle of February Paston's son, who had accompanied Norfolk to Wales, wrote from Holt Castle that the duke had had "great labour and cost here in Wales for to take divers gentlemen here which were consenting and helping on to the Duke of Somerset's going; and they were appealed of other certain points of treason, and this matter." The king had now given the duke power, the writer added, to "do execution upon these gentlemen or pardon them, whether that him list; and as fartheforth as I can understand yet they shall have grace."[2]

But if the traitors of Denbighshire found grace, some of their neighbours were not so lucky. There had been an uprising in Cheshire and Lancashire as well, and although the only account of it we have is the very brief one given in young Paston's letter, that is sufficient to prove that the situation was serious. "The commons in Lancashire and Cheshire were up to the number of a ten thousand or more," he wrote, "but now they be down again; and one or two of them was headed in Chester as on Saturday last past."[3]

When parliament reassembled at York on 20th February, Edward was still in Cambridgeshire and the Bishop of Lincoln pronounced a further adjournment till 5th May with the explanation that the commotions in the kingdom, especially in Gloucestershire, made it impossible for the king to be in York at that time.[1] Such a statement was a humiliating confession, and no better proof is needed that Somerset had some basis for the encouraging story he had told to Henry at Bamborough. Nevertheless, Somerset knew that local uprisings here and there would not suffice to drive Edward from the throne and, being as blind as Margaret to the true state of mind of the king of France and the growing strength of Edward's position in Europe in general, he was depending on help from abroad to attain his aim.

---

[1] Paston Letters, IV, 91; Rolls of Parl., V, 499; Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 23rd March. Markham and Danby were with Edward at Northampton and Coventry in January, as were also the Earls of Warwick and Worcester and Lords Hastings, Dudley, Rivers, and Wenlock. Coventry Leet Book, II, 325-326. Some brief annals written at Gloucester Abbey contain an account of a riot at Gloucester towards the close of 1463 and of what happened afterwards. See Kingsford, English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century, 356. It seems that Warwick visited Gloucester shortly before the king.

[2] Paston Letters, IV, 96. Paston mentions John Hammer, his son William, Roger Pulyston, and Edward of Madok as men who had been "appeached." The duke had to pursue Hammer for several days with a large force of men. See Expenses of Sir John Howard, etc., in Manners and Household Expenses of England, 160.

[3] Paston Letters, *ut sup*. Only a few months since the men of Cheshire, at a cost of three thousand marks, had bought a pardon and a confirmation of certain liberties which they and their ancestors had enjoyed since the days of Richard II. Warrants under the Signet, file 1377, 2nd July 3 Edw. IV; Charter Roll 2-4 Edw. IV, no. 193, m. 2-3; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 291.

At the end of February Edward hurried from Cambridge to London to meet some ambassadors from the king of Castile[2] who came on an errand of very exceptional interest, if, as it appears, this was the embassy which offered Edward the hand of Henry the Impotent's sister, Isabella of Castile. But though in more ways than one such a marriage would have been of great advantage to Edward, since it would have insured the treaty of alliance with Castile which he desired and might even have opened the way for him or his children to press his claim to the crown of Castile, it chanced that the Earl of Warwick's fancy had been caught by the matrimonial suggestion made by the king of France during the negotiations at Hesdin and, what was still more fatal, that Edward, though he had not as yet confided the fact to anyone save the lady of his choice, had already lost his heart. The marriage offer was declined, consequently, and though she knew little about the husband proposed for her, Isabella never forgave the slight she felt she had suffered. Years after, when Edward was in his grave and Isabella was queen of Castile and the wife of Ferdinand of Aragon, her ambassador informed Richard III that she had been "turned in her heart from England in time past for the unkindness the which she took against the king last deceased for his refusing of her and taking to his wife a widow of England."[3]

---

[1] Rolls of Parl., V, 499; Household Accounts, *ut sup.*

[2] The king reached Westminster on 27th February. Household Accounts. Paston was told in a letter from Richard Calle that the king had "sped him" to London to meet some ambassadors from the Duke of Burgundy. But Lannoy, the only ambassador who came from Philip about this time, did not arrive in London until after the middle of March.

As no other embassy from Castile seems to have come to England before Edward's marriage, this must have been the one that offered him Isabella's hand.

[3] Ellis, Original Letters, Series II, Vol. I, p. 152; Gairdner, Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Reigns of Richard III and Henry VII, I, 31. On the story that Warwick went to Spain to seek the hand of Isabella for Edward, see Scofield, Eng. Hist. Review, October, 1906, pp. 732-733.

Yet no doubt Edward couched his refusal of Isabella's hand in the politest terms, and certainly he did not forget to reward the ambassadors who had brought him so flattering an offer. The Spanish ambassadors seem to have returned home in April,[1] but before they took their leave one of them, whose name is given as Peter de Shecome, received a year's safeconduct for three ships "to come into this our realm of England in merchandwise, bringing wine of Navarre, wines of the growing of our duchy of Guienne and all other merchandises by our proclamation or otherwise forbidden only except," and to go home laden with "merchandises of this our realm." Another member of the embassy, Alonso Pieres Martel, knight, obtained a safeconduct for two ships to come and go "with all manner lawful merchandise"; and even the master of the carvel which had brought the ambassadors to England got a safeconduct for the same carvel to trade in English ports for a year.[2]

Henry the Impotent's ambassadors had not yet left England when the Seigneur de Lannoy arrived in London again. As the truce signed at Hesdin applied only to the land, it gave no protection to those who sailed the seas, and bitter fighting was still going on between French and English sailors. Such a state of things was not only disastrous to commerce; it might lead to violations of the truce and bring on war between France and England before the date set for the next St. Omer diet—an outcome which neither the Duke of Burgundy nor the king of France would welcome. As long ago as 10th December Philip had obtained from Edward a six months' safeconduct for Lannoy,[3] and Louis decided to make use of the duke's envoy, as he had done once before. On 9th February, in the hope of checking the "grande guerre" which was doing so much harm to French merchantmen, Louis empowered Lannoy to treat with Edward for a truce on the sea similar in terms to the existing truce on land. Immediately after, he dispatched one of his secretaries, a man called Le Begue, to Guines with a letter to Warwick in which he informed the earl of his intention to send Lannoy to England.[4]

---

[1] They seem to have started for home late in March and then, for some reason, to have come back again. Waurin, III, 182. The city of Canterbury made gifts of wine to them as they were going to or from London. Hist. MSS. Com., Report 9, app., 140.

[2] Writs of Privy Seal, file 796, no. 1349, and file 797, nos. 1369 and 1369A; French Roll 4 Edw. IV, m. 26.

[3] Rymer, XI, 511.

[4] Commynes-Lenglet, II, 413. Whetehill calls Le Begue "Jean de Tairmonde, dit Lebegue," while another writer refers to him as "Besgue de

Through the lieutenant of Guines, Richard Whetehill, Louis had already sent some message, probably relating to Lannoy's errand, to Edward, to the chancellor of England, and to Warwick, and he now appealed to Whetehill to see that his letter to Warwick reached its destination. The quickest and easiest way Louis could send a letter to England was through Calais, but considerations of speed and convenience were not the only inducements to choose that route. Warwick was captain of Calais, Guines, and Hammes, and the men in charge of those fortresses were his dependents. To win the good-will of the man is often a long step towards winning the good-will of the master, and the winning of the good-will of Warwick's men, of Whetehill in particular, was a part of Louis' preparations for that meeting with the great earl which he still hoped to have some day.[1] So Le Begue carried to Guines, besides the letter to Warwick, a safeconduct for Whetehill and Warwick's other officers and servants—apparently permitting them to enter French territory at will—and letters from Louis to Whetehill which were so gracious that when Whetehill wrote, on 19th February, to enclose Warwick's reply to the previous message sent by Louis and to promise the French king that his present letter should be forwarded at once to the earl, who would no doubt be most happy, he said, to hear of Lannoy's coming, he expressed not only humble thanks in his master's name and his own, but his readiness to serve the king of France " à mon petit pouvoir."[2]

On the day on which Whetehill wrote his letter to Louis, Louis met Philip of Burgundy at Lille[3] and, by holding out a promise of ten thousand men for the duke's crusade, persuaded him to postpone his departure for the Holy Land until the truce between France and England could be converted into a permanent peace.[4] On

---

Bizemont." Waurin, III, 184.

[1] Apparently Louis was making an effort to get hold of Sir Walter Blount also; for in a letter which Croy wrote to him about this time (on the 16th of some month, probably February), he reported that he had sent to Bruges to find Blount " pour le mener vers vous, comme par vos lettres le vous a plu moy mander," but that his messenger found that Blount had returned to Calais the day before. Croy added that he would now send the same messenger to Calais " affin de y retrouver ledit Messire Wattier le conduire et mener vers vous, se aler y veut." Legrand collections, MS. français 6970, f. 146.

[2] *Ibid.*, MS. français 6971, f. 388. (See Appendix III).

[3] Itinerary of Louis XI, Lettres de Louis XI, XI, 31; Commynes-Lenglet, II, 179.

[4] When the Venetians sought to draw France into their war with the Turks, Louis put them off by saying that he must first secure a permanent peace with the English. And earlier Philip had asked the Pope for permission to

8th March Philip announced to the three estates of Burgundy that, out of respect for the wishes of the king of France, he had decided to delay his expedition against the Turks for a year, that in the meantime, to satisfy the Pope and the princes to whom he had given his promise, he would send his bastard son, Anthony, with two thousand men, and that he himself would set out for the Holy Land before St. John's Day of the following year.[1]

Nine days after the announcement of Philip's decision Lannoy sailed for England,[2] and Le Begue crossed the sea at or about the same time. As Lannoy had made so many English friends during his previous visit to Edward's court, he had reason to expect a cordial welcome for himself personally, but it was by no means certain that the messages he was to deliver would meet with the same kind reception. For Edward had heard of Cousinot's visit to Bamborough, and that was quite enough to convince him that Louis was just as little to be trusted now as he had been before the signing of his truce with him. Even the old rumour that the French were getting ready to attack Calais was in circulation. On the evening of 19th March Le Begue, who had just arrived at Rochester, wrote a letter in which he complained that he had not been as kindly treated at Calais as usual, because it was said the French were going to lay siege to the town; and another letter which was written to Louis from Abbeville on the last day of March contains a reference to the same story.[3]

The writer of the Abbeville letter seems to have been one of Louis' officers who had just been visiting Guines to gather up news, and he enclosed with his own letter a copy of one which Whetehill had received from the Earl of Warwick and also a translation of

---

postpone the fulfilment of his crusading vow on the ground that he could not safely leave Europe until a peace had been signed between France and England. Perret, I, 419, 421.

[1] Du Clercq, liv. V, c.vii and viii. Anthony and Baldwin, another of Philip's many bastard sons, embarked at Sluys on 21st May. But they went no farther than Marseilles, and the death of Pius II on 14th August put an end to the whole crusade.

[2] Waurin, III, 182.

[3] Legrand collections, MS. français 6971, f. 394. (See Appendix IV). Le Begue was probably accompanied to England by Alexandre Sextre, groom of the chamber to Louis XI, as Edward granted Sextre a safeconduct for his homeward journey on 30th April. French Roll 4 Edw. IV, m. 9. Soon after this Sextre became Louis' *argentier* (Lettres de Louis XI, III, 158, note), and under that title we shall hear of him again. According to Legrand, he spent some time in England and is the "Alexandre" referred to in the letter written by Robert Neville on 17th November, 1464 (see Commynes-Dupont, III, 215).

Warwick's letter which Whetehill had made for Louis' benefit. In addition he reported several items of news which Whetehill wished Louis to know. The first item was that the Spanish embassy, which had been in England and had started for home, had gone back again: the second that Edward would go north soon after Easter to lay siege to Bamborough, where King Henry now was, and to other places which Henry held: the third that the English people were much displeased by Cousinot's presence at Bamborough:[1] and the fourth that it had been decided that the chancellor of England should go to the conference (at St. Omer, on 21st April) for the settlement of differences, although Whetehill thought Lannoy might be so successful in England that it would be unnecessary to hold the conference. Then the writer threw in another piece of news which, he jokingly remarked, Whetehill had *not* asked him to report. This was that during the seven or eight days he had spent at Guines the English were improving their defences and laying in supplies, as they were fearing a siege as soon as the truce expired. When he reminded them, he said, "pour leur donner bon couraige," that the king of France had garrisons at Gravelines, Ardres, Boulogne, and other places on their frontiers, they were angry and retorted with a word which would not bear repeating "sinon de bouche." Finally, he took care to let Louis know that the garrison of Calais had been weakened by the sending of thirty or forty men to join the Bastard of Burgundy's crusade.[2]

Although Le Begue had not been altogether pleased with the reception given him at Calais, he grew quite cheerful at Rochester, where, he wrote, he had been more cordially welcomed and where one of the Earl of Warwick's servants assured him that he would be met at Dartford on the following day by some of King Edward's men and the day after, as he neared London, by the Earl of Warwick and many other people. But possibly Warwick's servant was only making game of Louis' conceited, consequential secretary, or perhaps Warwick was more ready to welcome Le Begue than Edward was; for the last word the writer of the Abbeville letter had had about Le Begue was that he was at a village called "Rouge Moustier," which may be taken to mean Rochester, and that he was afraid to leave there lest he should be arrested. And apparently the poor man had some cause to be frightened, in as much as Lannoy himself seems to have been arrested on the pretext that, being from Picardy, he was a Frenchman, not a Burgundian.[1] However, Warwick quickly came to Lannoy's rescue, and when the "ambassador, deputy, and commissary of the excellent and mighty prince, our cousin, Louis of France, our adversary," reached London, Edward assigned him lodgings in the house of the Preaching Friars near Ludgate[2] and, on 28th March, empowered Warwick and Wenlock to negotiate with him.

---

[1] The writer makes a mistake in Cousinot's given name, calling him Pierre. In the records of the chapter of the cathedral of Rouen the following entry appears under the date of 7th April, 1464: "Guillaume Cousinot, baille de Rouen, de retour d'Angleterre oû il avait été prisonnier, remercie les Chanoines des prières qu'ils avaient faites pour lui." Inventaire-sommaire des archives départ., Seine-Inferieure, II, 234. Did Cousinot, to save appearances for Louis, pretend that he had been a prisoner at Bamborough?

[2] Waurin, III, 182-186. The uneasiness about Calais again led Edward to see that the garrison had no cause for dissatisfaction. See Warrants for Issues, 4 Edw. IV, 6th April.

The selection of Warwick and Wenlock to conduct the negotiations with him was a fortunate one for Lannoy, as Warwick was already feeling the effect of Louis' cajolery and Wenlock was entirely under Warwick's influence. It is not surprising, therefore, that Louis' ambassador secured the first thing he sought, which was a truce between England and France on the sea to begin on 20th May and to continue, like the truce on land, till the going down of the sun on 1st October. This truce was signed on 12th April and ratified by Edward on the 23rd. Edward was ready to go even farther, for he also gave Warwick and Wenlock authority to treat for an alliance between England, France, and Burgundy.[3] But Lannoy had not come to sign such an alliance. On the contrary, there is reason to think that he had been charged to seek a very different thing, namely, a secret alliance of England and France against Burgundy cemented by a double marriage arrangement which Louis had conceived.[4] To such an unexpected proposal as that, however, Edward, probably because he knew what violent opposition it would meet with from his people, as well as because he had secretly resolved to give his hand where his heart was already engaged, was not at all inclined to listen. Warwick, immediately after the signing of the truce on the sea, dispatched a herald to

---

[1] Mandrot, Dépêches, II, 99.

[2] Household Accounts, *ut sup.*

[3] Rymer, XI, 513, 518, 521; Commynes-Lenglet, II, 412-417. For proof that the truce on the sea was signed on 12th April, see Writs of Privy Seal, file 797, no. 1393.

[4] Commynes-Lenglet, II, 182; Du Clercq, liv. V, c.xviii, xxiii; Mandrot, Dépêches, II, 10.

France with a letter which encouraged Louis to think that a treaty of peace was in sight and to arrange an informal meeting between the English herald and his queen's sisters, Maria and Bona of Savoy, one of whom he hoped Edward would decide to marry and the other of whom he proposed to make the wife of the Duke of Milan. But though the herald greatly admired the two maidens, and though the Milanese ambassador, Malleta, who was then with Louis, wrote home that it was said the French king so desired the marriage alliance with Edward that he was even ready to furnish the dowry, it turned out that the only immediate fruit of the negotiations in London, aside from the truce on the sea, was an agreement that the St. Omer diet should be postponed until the first day of July and that ratifications of the new truce should be exchanged through the Duke of Burgundy before the first day of June.[1]

No, Louis gained a little more than that; for the day the truce was signed Edward granted his cousin of France a license to ship to England a thousand tuns of wine "of the growing of our countries of Guienne" and to sell it there regardless of any act or statute to the contrary. Two weeks later, at Louis' request, Edward also granted letters of protection for four merchant ships of Bordeaux, and at the same time he issued a proclamation permitting the importation of Guienne wine into England, though not directly from the duchy itself, until Michaelmas.[2]

Immediately after hearing from Warwick's herald that the truce on the sea had been signed, Louis announced that he would go to Flanders to meet Philip of Burgundy and the expected English ambassadors on 8th May and put the final touches, as he hoped, to the negotiations for a treaty of peace with England; and when he afterwards learned that the St. Omer diet had been postponed, he was considerably put out. The opinion of a good many persons around Louis was that, no matter what Edward's personal inclinations might be, the English people would prevent any peace negotiations with France;[3] and the prospect was hardly brightened by the receipt of a letter from Lannoy, written from Lille on his way home on 3rd May, which stated that something would have to be done to satisfy the English, especially the Earl of Warwick, about Cousinot.[1] In spite of all, however, Louis continued to pin his faith to Warwick, and soon he had the satisfaction of receiving a letter from the earl in which Warwick told him that he would come to meet him in Picardy in June to arrange a long truce or a treaty of peace. There was a story going about now that, to remove the danger of a marriage between Edward and Bona of Savoy, who was the younger but apparently the more attractive of the queen of France's sisters, the Duke of Burgundy was prepared to offer the English king the hand of one of his nieces, the sister of the Duke of Bourbon and the Countess of Charolais[2]—a marriage, it will be remembered, which Philip had not been willing to consider when it was proposed to him by the English embassy he entertained at Valenciennes in 1461. But that did not shake Louis' confidence; and the mission on which Cousinot had been sent by Henry and Margaret would probably have resulted in nothing, so far as the king of France was concerned, even had it not happened that, before Cousinot had had time to visit half of the persons to whom he was to appeal for assistance, there occurred in England the first of a series of events which were to make it practically useless for anyone to seek help for the house of Lancaster.

---

[1] Mandrot, Dépêches, II, 75, 80-81; Rymer, XI, 520-522.

[2] Writs of Privy Seal, file 797, no. 1374; French Roll 4 Edw, IV, m. 3 and 9; Close Roll 4 Edw. IV, m. 10 dorso and 13. In August Jean de Chasne, a French merchant and Louis' factor, was in England. French Roll 4 Edw. IV, m. 15; Signed Bills, file 1495, no. 4020. He probably had charge of the two thousand tuns of wine.

[3] Mandrot, Dépêches, II, 90, 98-99.

It must have been brought home to Lannoy during his last stay in London, if he had not realized the fact before, that the king of England was playing no small part in the politics of Europe. For Louis' ambassador encountered, or just missed encountering, a Spanish embassy in London and two English embassies left the city while he was there, the one to treat with the Hanseatic League, the other with the Scots.

In March, thanks to the earnest efforts of Cologne, it had been agreed that the diet between England and the Hanse towns should be held on St. John's Day and, as the king of Denmark, Dantzic, and the Livonian cities were all unwilling to send their representatives to any more distant place, at Hamburg. On 7th April, at the special request of Cologne, which had assured him that without doubt all disputes between England and the Hanse towns could be amicably settled at the diet, Edward confirmed the privileges of the Hansards in England for another year, beginning with St.

---

[1] Legrand's history, MS. français 6960, f. 616.

[2] Mandrot, Dépêches, II, 124, 126-127. Bona of Savoy was about fourteen years of age at this time. *Ibid.*, II, 195.

John's Day, 1465.[1] And on the 23rd he appointed Richard Caunton, Archdeacon of Salisbury, Doctor Henry Sharp, and two merchants of Bishop's Lynn, Henry Bermycham and Walter Cony, to represent him at the diet and to treat with the kings of Denmark and Poland and the Master of Prussia, as well as with the Hanse towns, for a perpetual peace or a truce with intercourse of merchandise.[2] But although these ambassadors started on their long journey, they were stopped at Utrecht by messages from the magistrates of Cologne informing them that the diet would have to be postponed, as a terrible plague was raging in Hamburg, a serious rebellion had broken out in Sweden, and the Master of Prussia was quarrelling with Livonia and Dantzic. Cologne made an effort to arrange for the holding of the diet at a later date, but without success. After waiting for several weeks at Utrecht, the English ambassadors returned home, and at the end of August the magistrates of Cologne wrote to Edward to explain and apologize.[3]

The negotiations which Edward was carrying on with Scotland while Lannoy was in London ended, as the king of France was by no means pleased to learn,[4] more satisfactorily than those he had undertaken with the Hanse towns. Yet in this case, too, there were hitches and delays. Perhaps because Cousinot's presence at Bamborough excited suspicion against the Scots as well as against Louis, Edward had not kept his promise to send an embassy on 6th March to negotiate with the Bishop of St. Andrews. But Kennedy sent to ask that another day might be set for the conference, and Edward then agreed that his commissioners should meet those of the king of Scotland at Newcastle on 20th April. He even granted a safeconduct to William Monypenny,[5] whom the bishop wanted to send to France, although, had he seen Monypenny's instructions, he certainly would have done nothing to facilitate his journey. For Monypenny was to give Louis warning that there was going to be a meeting of English and Scottish ambassadors at Newcastle which would probably terminate in the signing of a long peace between the two kingdoms, and while he was to make Louis see how badly he had treated his faithful friend, the Bishop of St. Andrews, in urging the bishop to stand by the house of Lancaster and then leaving him in the lurch by himself deserting King Henry, he was to end by saying that, whatever happened, the bishop would still do his utmost to preserve Scotland's ancient alliance with France, rather than any truce or alliance with England which might be signed, and would serve the king of France before all other living persons save his own king.[1]

---

[1] Hanserecesse, II, 5, pp. 414-416; French Roll 4 Edw. IV, m. 22. Edward's warrant for the confirmation of the privileges of the Hansards dated back to 16th February. Writs of Privy Seal, file 796, no. 1338.

[2] See Rymer, XI, 522-523, for the commissions to treat with the kings of Denmark and Poland, and Writs of Privy Seal, file 797, no. 1395, for the commission to treat with the Hanse towns and the Master of Prussia. Caunton had asked for letters of protection on 7th April, and he received them the next day. Signed Bills, file 1494, no. 3961; French Roll 4 Edw. IV, m. 3.

[3] Hanserecesse, II, 5, pp. 422-429; Cal. Diplomatic Documents (Exchequer, T. of R.), 48th Report of Deputy Keeper, 603-604. For their services at this time, Caunton and Sharp were each allowed 20s. a day for six months, Bermycham and Cony half of that amount, and a part of the money was paid to them in advance. Issue Roll, Easter 4 Edw. IV, 11th June.

[4] Mandrot, Dépêches, II, 99.

[5] 10th March. Rotuli Scotiæ, II, 410.

On 5th April Edward named the Earl of Warwick, the Bishop of Exeter, Lord Montagu, and others as his commissioners to negotiate with the Scots and authorized them to treat for a perpetual peace. But the negotiations with Lannoy kept Warwick in London and the responsibility for those with Scotland fell mainly on the shoulders of the Bishop of Exeter, who again handed over the great seal to Robert Kirkham and then started for Newcastle.[2] By the time the bishop reached York, however, it was decided that the negotiations would have to take place there instead of at Newcastle, as the Duke of Somerset and Sir Ralph Percy, making the most of Warwick's absence in London, had issued out of Bamborough and were raiding the country roundabout with so much success that they seem to have taken and held Norham for a short time and even to have penetrated into the West Riding of Yorkshire and captured the castle of Skipton in Craven.[3]

The duty of escorting the Scottish envoys to York devolved on Lord Montagu, and he started for the border with a small armed force. But Somerset and Percy had heard of his journey, and he learned just in time that Humphrey Neville was lying in wait for him in a wood near Newcastle. By changing his route he avoided that danger, but a little farther on, on Hedgeley Moor, about nine miles from Alnwick, Somerset and Percy themselves

[1] Waurin, III, 164-175.

[2] Rymer, XI, 514-515, 517-518; Cal. Documents relating to Scotland, IV, 272; Paston Letters, IV, 101. For the king's warrant for the delivery of the great seal to Kirkham, see Writs of Privy Seal, file 797, no. 1367.

[3] Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 178. The castle of Skipton in Craven was recovered after the battle of Hexham, and it was then granted to Sir William Stanley. Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 342.

fell upon him. Lords Hungerford and Roos were with Somerset and Percy, and they had gathered together every man they could find; but Montagu was more than their equal. "This meeting was upon Saint Mark's Day," is Gregory's laconic account of the battle, "and that same day was Sir Ralph Percy slain. And when that he was dead, all the party was discomfited and put to rebuke. And every man avoided and took his way with full sorry hearts."[1]

After routing Somerset and Percy on Hedgeley Moor, Montagu encountered no more enemies, but rode in safety to Norham, met the Scottish envoys there, and brought them to York.[2] Before the negotiations with the Scots had gone far, however, other events of great importance took place.

As Louis had been told in the letter sent to him from Abbeville, Edward was preparing while Lannoy was in England to go to Northumberland and lay siege to Bamborough and the other places which clung to Henry. This was no secret, for ten days after Lannoy arrived in England a proclamation had announced the king's intention to go north again and, in spite of the grant that had been made to him in the preceding year for the defence of the kingdom, had made another demand for money—a demand which was as arbitrary, if not as illegal, as forced loans, though it was less likely to excite general indignation, because it affected only those upon whom special favours had been bestowed. The king was going north in the beginning of the summer, the proclamation stated, to reduce to obedience the castles which were "kept by his traitors and rebels," and for that reason, by the advice of his council, he had ordained that all his subjects to whom he had granted lands, annuities, fees, or offices worth ten marks a year or more should, on pain of forfeiture of such grants, pay the fourth part of the said yearly value in money at the city of York on 5th May next coming to such persons as he might appoint to receive it.[3]

---

[1] Gregory, 223-224. The first reports from the battlefield were, as usual, full of exaggerations. See Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 156. Tradition says that Percy cried out as he lay dying, "I have saved the bird in my bosom," meaning that he had kept his oath to King Henry. But if this be true, he must have forgotten, as Hall remarks, that in Henry's "most necessity" he had abandoned him and submitted to Edward.

[2] Gregory, *ut sup.*

[3] Close Roll 4 Edw. IV, m. 28 dorso, 27th March. Evidently complaint was made after this proclamation went forth that York was an inconvenient place at which to pay the money, for a month later a second proclamation gave permission for payment to be made at the Exchequer of Receipt. *Ibid.*, m. 10 dorso.

Edward did not expect to raise all the money that he would need for another siege of the Northumbrian castles by means of this proclamation. The city of London loaned him a thousand marks, the dean and chapter of St. Paul's loaned him a hundred pounds, taking as security half a dozen silver-gilt cups and a tabernacle of gold ornamented with a crucifix and images of the Virgin and St. John the Evangelist enamelled in white; and other loans of considerable amount were secured from several private individuals, including William Hatclyf, now one of the king's physicians and secretaries, and Henry Waver, a wealthy London draper.[1] Gerard Caniziani, factor and attorney of the "fellowship of the Medicis of Florence," a man whose name will appear frequently from now on, also let the king have eight hundred marks, and a thousand marks were obtained from the merchants of the staple.[2] Even this was not all; for just after he had left London for the north the king sent back a brief letter to the chancellor enclosing a patent which had been sent to him by his council "for shipping of eight thousand woollen cloths, grained or not grained, thought necessary and expedient to be done for chevisance of good towards our great charges borne and to be borne at this time." Two days later one James de Sanderico was commissioned to ship the eight thousand cloths.[3]

These shifts show how hard it was for Edward to raise any large sum of money. But whatever the difficulties, Northumberland must be reduced to submission, not only because Somerset could always spread terror in the northern counties as long as he had the Northumbrian castles to fall back to, but because in much less remote parts of the kingdom the spirit of rebellion which had shown itself in such an alarming way after Somerset's flight was still in evidence, and it was plain that England would never know real peace until

[1] London Journal 7, f. 66b; Writs of Privy Seal, file 798, no. 1421; Receipt Roll, Easter 4 Edw. IV; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 324, 326. Edward seems to have had two physicians at this time, Hatclyf and Jakes Fryse, and one surgeon, Richard Felde. Rolls of Parl., V, 529.

[2] Caniziani received in return for his loan a license to export 200 sacks of wool free of customs and subsidy, and the staplers got a temporary exemption from the wool duties. Writs of Privy Seal, file 797, no. 1400; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 378. The king also ventured to borrow £3,000 from the money which had been set aside out of the grant from the Commons to pay the arrears of wages at Calais, but the entire sum seems to have been absorbed by his private expenses. Warrants for Issues, 4 Edw. IV, 27th April; Receipt Roll, *ut sup.*; Issue Roll, Easter 4 Edw. IV, 25th April and 7th May.

[3] Warrants under the Signet, file 1377, 21st May; French Roll 4 Edw. IV, m. 14.

Henry VI had rendered up, if not his life, at least his last inch of English territory. Even in London the common council had had to send to prison one John Poynaunt, hosier, because on several occasions he had made bold to read publicly at Paul's Cross some incendiary document likely to excite commotions among the people.[1] And just before he went north, Edward spent several days at Dartford punishing a murderous outbreak which probably had its political significance. "The king hath been in Kent," wrote Clement Paston on 18th April, "and there been indicted many for Isley's death; and he will come to town this day again, and he will not tarry here but forth to York straight."[2]

Edward did not go to York quite as soon as Clement Paston expected. But on 25th April he directed that commissions should be given to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Earl of Warwick to prorogue parliament from 5th May until 15th October—or rather, as the date was altered before the commissions were actually drawn up, until 26th November—and three days later he left London.[3] Even then, however, he did not hasten his steps. For whatever his councillors and subjects supposed, it was not for fighting only that the king was setting out.

Edward spent two nights at St. Alban's, under Abbot Whethamstede's roof, and then rode to Stony Stratford.[4] There he stopped only one night, but it was a memorable one; for very early the next morning—May Day morning, just the time for romance—without confiding his intention to anyone, he rode over to Lord Rivers's home at Grafton-Regis and there married, "pour sa beauté et par amourette," a lady who was five years his senior and already the mother of two sons, Elizabeth Woodville, eldest daughter of Lord Rivers and the Dowager Duchess of Bedford and widow of the Lord Ferrers of Groby who had fallen at St. Albans while fighting for Margaret of Anjou against the Earl of Warwick. The only witnesses of the wedding of this strangely assorted pair were the bride's mother, who had probably been the chief promoter of the match, two gentlewomen, the priest who performed the ceremony, and a young man "to help the priest sing"; and in a few hours the king rode back to Stony Stratford, explained to his attendants that he had been hunting, and went to bed again as if to sleep off fatigue.[1] Later in the same day he proceeded to Northampton, and from Northampton he went on to Leicester, where he spent ten days, probably waiting for troops to join him.[2]

---

[1] London Journal 7, f. 65b.

[2] Paston Letters, IV, 101. Edward was at Dartford from 14th to 18th April. Privy Seals.

[3] Writs of Privy Seal, file 798, no. 1404; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 325; Household Accounts. In the end neither the archbishop nor Warwick prorogued parliament. The task fell to the Abbot of Fountains, who acted in Warwick's place. Rolls of Parl., V, 500.

[4] Household Accounts.

Meanwhile Warwick, little dreaming that his royal master had gone a-courting and a-marrying, had hurried north as soon as the negotiations with Lannoy were completed, while commissions of array were sent into no less than twenty-two counties, the whole southern half of the realm, and royal proclamations bade the king's subjects to hasten to his side wherever he might be.[3] As it turned out, however, neither the king nor Warwick was needed in Northumberland, as on 15th May Lord Montagu won another victory, and such a decisive one that it was possible to send home a part, if not all, of the men who had just been called to the king's aid.[4]

Instead of withdrawing to Bamborough after their defeat on Hedgeley Moor, Somerset, Hungerford, and Roos had pushed a little farther south, taking King Henry with them; and early in May, while Henry rested at Bywell Castle, they were hovering about Newcastle, boldly inviting another battle. Montagu was not one to decline such a challenge, and on 14th May, with Lords Greystock and Willoughby and a strong force of men, he started out to deal another blow to the enemies of the house of York. He did not have far to go, as Somerset had encamped at Linnels, about a mile from Hexham, and the following morning he attacked the duke there with such suddenness and vigour that the rout was even more complete than that on Hedgeley Moor. Somerset himself was captured by the servants of Sir John Middleton, carried to

---

[1] Fabyan, 654; Hearne's Fragment, 293; Gregory, 226; Warkworth, 3; Rolls of Parl., VI, 241; Du Clercq, liv. V, c.xviii. Du Clercq and some of the other foreign chroniclers throw out hints against the character of Elizabeth Woodville, intimating that her relations with Edward had been too intimate before their marriage; and Louis XI stated to the Milanese ambassador that Edward had married a widow by whom he had already had two children. Mandrot, Dépêches, II, 304. But it is pleasant to notice that none of the English chroniclers have a word of this sort to say against Edward's queen.

[2] Household Accounts. Before leaving London, Edward had written to the mayor of Salisbury to send men to meet him at Leicester on 10th May. Hatcher, Old and New Sarum, 159. Fabyan's statement that the king soon went back to Grafton-Regis and spent four days with his bride seems to be erroneous.

[3] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 391; Rymer, XI, 523.

[4] Paston Letters, IV, 107.

Hexham, and there, with four other prisoners, immediately beheaded.[1] Two days after the battle Hungerford and Roos were found hiding in the woods, taken to Newcastle, and beheaded, along with Sir Thomas Findern and two other men; and the next day Sir Philip Wentworth and six more men lost their heads at Middleham. On the 26th fourteen other prisoners were beheaded at York, after being tried and condemned by the Earl of Worcester, and finally, though this was not until two months later, Sir William Tailboys was taken in a coalpit somewhere in Riddesdale and beheaded at Newcastle. In this last victim's possession was found three thousand marks, money which was to have been paid to Somerset's men and which proved a "very wholesome salve" for Lord Montagu's tired troops.[2]

Montagu had but one cause for regret; King Henry had escaped. The king's bycocket, "garnished with two crowns of gold and fret with pearls and rich stones," and also three of his henchmen, "trapped with blue velvet," were found in Bywell Castle, but whither the king himself had fled no one could discover.[3] Even though King Henry had vanished, however, the victory won at Hexham was a most important one, and when, a week later, Montagu proudly delivered the bycocket and the three henchmen to Edward at Pontefract, the king was not slow to recognize and reward the great service he had rendered. On 27th May, in the palace at York, Montagu was made Earl of Northumberland, and two months later he received a grant of all the lands which had belonged to the Earl of Northumberland who fell in the battle of Towton.[4] As for

---

[1] In the bill renewing Somerset's attainder (Rolls of Parl., V, 511) the date of the battle of Hexham is given as 8th May. But not only do the chroniclers say that it occurred on 15th May, but in the account rendered by the escheator of London for certain jousting accoutrements formerly belonging to Somerset it is stated that the duke was sentenced to death and beheaded at Hexham in the bishopric of Durham on the 15th day of May in the fourth year of the reign of Edward IV. Enrolled Accounts, Escheator's Account 75/60. The duke was buried in the priory church of Hexham.

[2] Gregory, 224-226, and xxix, note b; Worcester, 782; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 79, 178-179; Warkworth, 4; Kingsford's London Chron., 178; Fabyan, 654; Hall, 260. See also an extract from the year book for Easter Term, 4 Edw. IV, which is printed in Raine's Priory of Hexham, I, cviii-lxi, and which is interesting in spite of some confusion of facts. For the date of Tailboys' death, which occurred later than Gregory leads one to suppose, namely, on 20th July, see Inquisitions, Miscellaneous, Chancery, file 319. Hungerford's body was carried to Salisbury to be interred in the cathedral. Dugdale. Findern's son fought with Warwick at the battle of Barnet. Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 336.

[3] Kingsford's London Chron.; Fabyan; Three Fif. Cent. Chron.

[4] Kingsford's London Chron.; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 332, 340-341; Close

Henry Percy, the rightful heir to the earldom of Northumberland, he was given a home in the king's prison of the Fleet, where four servants attended to his wants and Alice Venour, the keeper of the prison, was allowed *26s. 8d.* a week for his expenses. When John Paston had the bad luck to spend a little time in the Fleet, he enjoyed the acquaintance of "Lord Percy" there.[1]

Edward had not come to York merely to bestow an earldom on Montagu. He had also come to try to bring to a conclusion the negotiations with the Scottish ambassadors whom Montagu had escorted to York after the battle of Hedgeley Moor. For those negotiations had been making little headway, probably because an English ship, the *Katerine Duras*, had recently captured a Scottish carvel that was carrying home the Bishop of Aberdeen and King James's own brother, Alexander, Duke of Albany, who was returning from a visit to his uncle in Guelderland. As Edward had granted the Duke of Albany a safeconduct, the act of the master of the *Katerine Duras* was doubly inexcusable, and the Scots were so angry that they threatened to declare war.[2] Had Edward known that it was to Scotland that Henry had fled again,[3] he might have been tempted to hold Albany and the Bishop of Aberdeen as hostages; but being ignorant of Henry's whereabouts, he at once ordered them to be set at liberty. This seems to have satisfied the Scots, and on 1st June, in the chapter house at York, another truce between England and Scotland was signed. And this time it was a long truce, for it was to begin on the last day of October and endure for fifteen years.

Edward ratified the truce two days after it was signed and on 11th June named two commissions, one headed by the Earl of Warwick as warden of the west march, the other by the new Earl of Northumberland as warden of the east march, to meet representatives of James III on 23rd July and treat for the redress of breaches of the truce.[4] But the case of the Duke of Albany and the Bishop of Aberdeen had to be dealt with separately. Though

---

Roll 4 Edw. IV, m. 20; Warkworth, 36. Edward reached Pontefract on 22nd May and went to York the next day. Household Accounts.

[1] Tellers' Roll, Mich. 4 Edw. IV; Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 1st March; Devon, Issues of the Exchequer, 488; Paston Letters, IV, 190, 196. Percy was afterwards removed to the Tower.

[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 348-349; Rymer, XI, 520; Buchanan, BK. XII c.xvii.

[3] Lesley, 36.

[4] Rymer, XI, 525, 527; Rotuli Scotiæ, II, 413-414.

they had been set free, the duke and the bishop found it no easy matter to make a satisfactory settlement with their captors, and on 8th July Edward had to appoint the Earl of Worcester and others to make a thorough investigation of the whole affair. In the end, however, this and all other differences were so happily arranged that the Bishop of Aberdeen, and even the Bishop of St. Andrews himself, condescended to accept an annuity from the king of England.[1]

Edward spent several weeks in Yorkshire, perhaps in part because the plague had broken out in London. So serious was the epidemic that it was said the deaths numbered as many as two hundred a day, and the courts had to be adjourned until Michaelmas.[2] But Edward had other reasons, too, for staying in the north so long. For one thing, he had an errand at Doncaster. Pius II was now planning to set out for the Holy Land in July, and he had attempted to levy a tenth on the clergy of England for his crusade. Such a levy Edward would not hear of, as it would establish a dangerous precedent, and he had refused to allow the papal bulls to be brought into the kingdom. Nevertheless, he was anxious that England should make some contribution to the crusade, not only because it was seemly, but because Philip of Burgundy as well as the Pope was so deeply interested in the undertaking; and he had ended by consenting that a subsidy should be granted *to himself* for the crusade through the diocesan synods.[3] One of those diocesan synods was soon to be held at Doncaster and Edward meant to attend it.

But probably the chief reason why the king lingered in Yorkshire was that he wished to be near while the work in Northumberland was being completed. Sir Ralph ~~Percy~~ and Humphrey Neville of Brancepeth were still intrenched in the great castles on the coast and, soon after he received his earldom, Montagu hurried off to attack them. It seems to have been the first intention that Warwick should direct the siege of the castles again,[4] but in the end he was sent off on a very different errand and his brother was left to finish the task alone.

---

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 348-349; Cal. Documents relating to Scotland, IV, 276. Both annuities ran from Easter, 1464, but it does not necessarily follow that they were granted before that date.

[2] Cal. Venetian Papers, I, 114; Close Roll 4 Edw. IV, m. 2.

[3] Wilkins, Concilia, 594 *et seq.;* Wake, 377-378; Hist. Croy. Cont., 534.

[4] See the joint commission given to Warwick and Montagu on 11th June. Rymer, XI, 527.

Two of the castles soon surrendered, for Alnwick was "delivered by appointment" on 23rd June and Dunstanborough yielded on the same or the following day.[1] But the reduction of Bamborough, before which Montagu arrived on 25th June, proved to be a harder matter. To two heralds who were sent to the castle with a demand for surrender and a promise of pardon to all except Grey and Neville, Grey replied that he would live or die in the castle; and when one of them threatened him, saying that the king did not want the castle to be injured and would demand a head, beginning with that of Grey himself, for every shot which damaged the walls, his only answer was to turn on his heel and prepare to fight. So the guns had to be fired, and soon, thanks to "*Newcastle*, the king's great gun, and *London*, the second gun of iron," the stones of the castle walls went flying "unto the sea," while *Dijon*, a big brazen gun which appears frequently in lists of stores kept at Calais and which, as its name suggests, had once belonged to the Duke of Burgundy, "smote through Sir Ralph Grey's chamber oftentimes."[2]

At last Grey was so badly hurt by a falling wall that he was thought to be dead, and then Humphrey Neville surrendered the castle after cleverly bargaining that everyone in it except Grey should be received into the king's grace. But unluckily Grey came to life, and as no mercy had been promised to him, he was carried to the king. A few days later, at Doncaster, he was brought to trial before the Earl of Worcester. The earl reminded him that he had borne arms against the king, who had trusted him with the keeping of his castles, that he had betrayed Sir John Ashley, a brother knight of the Garter, with the result that Ashley was now a prisoner of the French, and that he had "withstood and made fences" against the king and the king's lieutenant, the Earl of Warwick; and he warned him that he must prepare to die, although for the sake of his grandfather,[3] who "suffered trouble for the king's most noble predecessors," the king would spare him the disgrace of degradation from knighthood and the loss of his "arms and noblesse." "Then, Sir Ralph Grey, this shall be thy penance," announced the earl. "Thou shalt go on thy feet unto the town's end, and there thou shalt be laid down and drawn to a scaffold made for thee; and thou shalt have thine head smit off, thy body to be buried in the Friars, thy head where it please the king."[1]

---

[1] Warkworth, 37.

[2] *Ibid.*, 37-38. The name here given to the big brazen gun is *Dysyon*, but there is little doubt that it should be *Dijon*, as has been suggested by Cadwallader Bates, Border Holds of Northumberland, 257, note. There was also a gun named *London* at Calais, but at the time of Edward's accession it was reported to be broken into two pieces, and one of the pieces was afterwards made into a chamber for *Dijon*. Other guns kept at Calais were named the *Saint Paul*, the *Crown*, the *Gloucester Gross Fowler*, and the *Dame Anable*. See Foreign Rolls, 2 Edw. IV, m. B, and 7 Edw. IV, m. I; and other Calais accounts.

[3] Sir Thomas Grey, beheaded at Southampton on 5th August, 1415.

Grey's execution took place on 10th July and soon after his head was to be seen on London Bridge.[2] But the king did not witness the execution. His attention was riveted at this moment less on Grey, who was powerless to do him further harm, than on the diocesan synod, and he did not come to Doncaster until the 14th, the day after the synod assembled.[3] A subsidy of sixpence in the pound for the crusade was immediately granted to him by the synod, and soon after other synods held in other dioceses made him similar grants. But in the following month Pius II died just as he was starting for the Holy Land; and although his successor, Paul II, announced his intention to carry out the noble project for which Pius had laboured so persistently and asked the Archbishop of Canterbury to assist him by special prayers and processions, the crusade never took place.[4] So the money granted by the diocesan synods remained in Edward's pocket.[5] Perhaps the king's good angel had told him that thus the matter would end.

Edward left Doncaster on 16th July and went slowly back to Leicester. For the second time Northumberland had been conquered for him by the Nevilles, and once more he was "possessed of all England except a castle in North Wales called Harlech." And as for Harlech, though it was still in hostile hands and Lord Herbert, who had been granted the constableship of the castle,[6] began a long siege of the place in the autumn of this year, what serious trouble could it cause? If Queen Margaret attempted to invade England again, it might serve her as a landing place; but who was likely to help Margaret when she was a penniless guest under her father's roof, when Henry was a fugitive in hiding, Somerset in his grave, and the kings of France and Scotland at peace with Edward? Surely Edward's throne was safe at last.

---

[1] Warkworth, 38-39; Worcester, 782; Gregory, 227.

[2] Inquisitions *post mortem*, 5 Edw. IV, no. 27; Gregory; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 179.

[3] Household Accounts.

[4] Wilkins and Wake, *ut sup.*; Hist. MSS. Com., Report 9, app., 104. It was not until 14th December that Edward gave orders for the "commission of authority" for the receivers of the subsidy granted by the synods. Warrants under the Signet, file 1378.

[5] See the articles of complaint against Edward which Warwick afterwards put forth. Warkworth, 49.

[6] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 271, 352, 355. Herbert was allowed £2,000 for the siege of Harlech, and "divers habiliments of war" were carried to him by the master of the ordnance. Issue Roll, Easter 6 Edw. IV, 22nd April.

BOOK III

THE STRUGGLE WITH WARWICK

CHAPTER I

THE MARRIAGE ANNOUNCEMENT

THREE months had gone by since the secret wedding at Grafton Regis and Edward had said nothing about it to anyone—least of all to the Earl of Warwick. For Warwick was not inclined to underestimate the services he had rendered to the house of York, and considering the debt which Edward undoubtedly owed him, it was but natural that he should expect the young king to consult him before taking any step of importance. Of course Edward knew all this perfectly well; and he also knew that his choice of a wife was a matter in which the earl took the deepest interest. It may even be that the determination Warwick had shown to dispose of the royal hand according to his own judgment and pleasure, as, for instance, when he proposed to give it to Mary of Gueldres, was one reason why Edward had been tempted to choose a wife in haste and in secret to suit his own taste. Very likely Elizabeth Woodville and her mother had taken advantage of the king's thoughtlessness and youthful passion, but after all, Edward was not too young or too thoughtless to realize that, in marrying the widow of Lord Ferrers of Groby, he was doing a thing which was both very strange and very unwise. Neither was he too young or too thoughtless to foresee that his choice, and also his manner of making it, would enrage the man by whose assistance he had both won and held his crown. If he had made a prompt and frank confession of his marriage and then done all in his power to appease Warwick's wrath, he might possibly have won forgiveness after a while. But, like all easy-going people, he detested a quarrel, and he put off the evil day of confession as long as he could. What was far worse, he let Warwick go on laying matrimonial plans for him!

The bride Warwick now had in mind for his king was the same one the king of France had picked out for him, namely, Bona of

Savoy; and by this time the earl had been so completely won over to Louis XI's point of view by dint of flattering letters, by Louis' cultivation of the good-will of his dependents, and perhaps by other means no longer discoverable, that he had actually persuaded himself that nothing could possibly be of so much benefit to England or to the house of York as a close alliance with France. Undoubtedly he knew as well as Edward did how the English people would feel about such an alliance, but that knowledge did not alter his purpose nor serve to explain to him why the king seemed to be so little disposed to accept the bride he was urging upon him; and at last, with haughty disregard for the wishes and judgment of all except himself and those deriving their thoughts from him, he resolved to take the matter into his own hands and drive his curiously hesitant master into the French marriage. Hence his letter to Louis saying that he would come to Picardy.

On hearing that Warwick would come to Picardy, Louis, again filled with pleasure at the prospect of making the personal acquaintance of the great English earl, immediately laid plans to go to meet him, first on 8th June and afterwards, apparently, when it seemed that the earl could not come so early, on St. John's Day.[1] Yet Lord Wenlock and Richard Whetehill—the latter still Warwick's lieutenant at Guines and Louis' obliged friend—were the only persons Edward named, on 8th June, to represent him at St. Omer.[2] And on 12th June the Milanese ambassador who was then at Amiens with Louis reported that the French king seemed to be perplexed by some letters he had received from England and had told him that, as King Edward had succeeded in cutting to pieces the Duke of Somerset and some of the other lords who adhered to Henry VI, he feared the king would now be so proud that it would be difficult to get him to conclude a peace with France.[3] In spite of all this, however, on 17th June Warwick left London for the continent with ninety attendants and one hundred horses and a safeconduct which Louis had sent to him on some previous occasion, probably before the other St. Omer diet. A shipload of "muttons, veals, and other goods" which the earl sent over for his use during the diet was seized by the men of St. Malo[4]—to the great wrath of

[1] Mandrot, Dépêches, II, 131.

[2] Rymer, XI, 526.

[3] Mandrot, Dépêches, II, 182-183.

[4] Accounts, etc. (Exchequer K. R.), bundle 324, no. 21; Scofield, Eng. Hist Review, Oct., 1906, pp. 732-737. Legrand states in his history (MS. français 6960, f. 618) that Louis paid some money to Whetehill at Abbeville

Louis, who had taken pains to send Francis II a copy of the new truce with the English on the sea and had just scolded him sharply because of other violations of it by the men of St. Malo[1]—but he himself made a safe passage from Dover to Calais, while Louis took Bona of Savoy to Dompierre and then went to talk matters over with Philip of Burgundy at Hesdin.[2]

Louis spent three days with Philip, and at his departure he gave the duke a promise to return in time for the opening of the diet with the English. But when he got back to Dompierre, he received letters both from Edward and from Warwick himself which, without giving any hint, apparently, of Warwick's presence at Calais, stated that certain matters affecting the welfare of England made it impossible for the earl to be at St. Omer on the first day of July but held out the hope that, if the diet could be postponed until about the middle of August, he might be able to come to it then.[3] Louis' disappointment was intense, just as it had been the year before when he thought he was going to meet Warwick and the earl failed to come. But there was no help for it, and he went back to Hesdin on 2nd July to await the arrival of Wenlock and Whetehill, the only English ambassadors, as it was now known, who were coming for the diet.

As before, Edward's ambassadors were escorted from Calais by the Seigneur de Lannoy and the bailli of St. Omer, and the very evening of their arrival at Hesdin they were summoned to the presence of Louis and Philip. Louis was disappointed again when he found that the Englishmen were not authorized to do more than prolong the truce, and when he asked them why their king had not sent a more imposing embassy and one intrusted with higher powers, the only excuse they had to offer was that the state of affairs in England, especially the necessity of conquering Bamborough, made it impossible for Edward to keep his appointment with his cousin

---

in reparation for the plundering of the *Trinity* of London by the men of St. Malo. This was probably the ship here referred to, as one of Warwick's ships bore that name. See Paston Letters, IV, 57.

[1] Lettres de Louis XI, II, 184-185, 191-199, 382-383; Morice, III, 70-72.

[2] Chastellain, IV, 495, 497-498; itinerary of Louis XI, Lettres de Louis XI; Gachard, Itinéraire de Philippe le Bon. For further proof that Louis confidently expected to see Warwick at this time and had come to Hesdin on this occasion, as in the preceding year, for that purpose, see his statement to the Count of Charolais, Lettres de Louis XI, III, 90.

[3] See a letter (to the Count of Maine ?) which, though assigned by Legrand to the year 1463, evidently belongs to 1464 and to the days immediately after the arrival of Wenlock and Whetehill for the diet. MS. français 20, 489, f. 46 (the original letter); MS. français 6970, f. 323 (Legrand's copy).

of France. They even asked for a still longer postponement of the diet, until the first day of October. At that time, they said, the king of England would not fail to send an embassy worthy of the occasion, as he had promised. And once more Louis was given reason to hope that the Earl of Warwick would be one of Edward's ambassadors and that a treaty of peace would then be signed.[1]

Louis tried hard not to show his chagrin, and during the negotiations which followed and which resulted in an extension of the truce between England and France until 1st October, 1465,[2] he sought to bind Wenlock to his interests by hinting that those who helped him to secure a peace or a long truce with the king of England would not go unrewarded. He also invited Wenlock and Whetehill to Dompierre to feast with the ladies, and when they came, he pointed out to them his queen's sisters, who had been beautifully attired for the occasion according to his special directions, and one of whom, he said, he hoped King Edward would take as his bride.[3] This time Wenlock was definitely offered a large reward if he would help to bring about the marriage between Edward and Bona of Savoy, and he promised to do his best. Then Louis made gifts of "belle vaisselle" both to Wenlock and to Whetehill, and they returned to Hesdin. On 8th July the Englishmen were feasted by the Duke of Burgundy beside the fountains in the park at Hesdin, and they probably went back to Calais soon after.[4]

Louis had told Philip that he would stay in the neighbourhood of St. Omer until the new date set for the diet with the English, but on 9th July he suddenly departed. Word had come to him that an English fleet was cruising near his coasts, and as he had as little faith in Edward as Edward had in him, he set off post haste for Normandy to see that the English did not attempt to make a landing there.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.;* Chastellain, V, 21-23; Mandrot, Dépêches, II, 215.

[2] Commynes-Lenglet, II, 181.

[3] The Milanese ambassador in France remarked that this was the first time an ambassador from Edward IV had set foot in a town belonging to the king of France, as heretofore all of Edward's ambassadors had been sent to the Duke of Burgundy. And he drew from the willingness of the Englishmen to go to Dompierre the conclusion that there was an understanding between Edward and Louis which was being kept secret on account of the sentiments of the English people. Mandrot, Dépêches, II, 214.

[4] Chastellain, V, 23-24; Mandrot, Dépêches, II, 213-214; Itinéraire de Philippe le Bon, 93; Scofield, *ut sup.* It was not until the following spring that Edward ordered £20 to be paid to Whetehill for his expenses while accompanying Wenlock from Calais "unto Louis, our adversary of France, to the Castle of Hesdin in Picardy, there abiding for certain our great matters and returning to our said town." Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 6th May.

The English ships that frightened Louis were probably those which were carrying home the Earl of Warwick and his ninety attendants. For the earl reached London again on 5th August. Seven weeks Warwick had stayed beyond the sea on his embassy to the Duke of Burgundy, as his journey was officially described, and for the whole forty-nine days of his absence he drew the large salary of 66*s.* 8*d.* a day.[2] Yet seemingly the earl had not gone beyond Calais, and though Philip of Burgundy must have known that he was at Calais—after Lannoy and the bailli of St. Omer went thither to meet Wenlock and Whetehill, if not before—to the end Louis seems to have remained in ignorance of the fact that Warwick had left England for any purpose. Edward had certainly got himself into a pretty predicament, and he probably trumped up some excuse at the last moment for ordering Warwick not to go beyond Calais and to keep his presence even there a profound secret. Nevertheless, just five days after his return to London, the earl set out for the continent again. But this time he did not start off with the idea that he was going to talk with Louis about a bride for Edward. Instead, he went, probably with much reluctance, to conduct some secret negotiations with Philip of Burgundy.

On his second journey, Warwick took with him only sixty attendants and sixty-five horses, and again he crossed from Dover to Calais. As Philip was at Hesdin throughout the month of August,[3] the earl must have met the duke there, if he met him at all. And this time Warwick certainly went farther than Calais, as proof exists that he returned to Calais on 30th August, on which day his allowance for his services, which was again 66*s.* 8*d.* a day, ceased.[4] But if he met Philip at Hesdin, or if Philip sent envoys to meet him at some other place nearer Calais, all was done so secretly that not one of the Burgundian chroniclers, not even Chastellain, who had first hand knowledge of so much that transpired at Philip's court, ever discovered the fact.

In all probability both the excuse which Edward had found for stopping Warwick at Calais at the time of the earl's first journey and the secret matters about which the earl went to consult Philip on his second journey had some connection with the alliance which the Duke of Brittany and the Count of Charolais had formed against Louis and which ended in the following year in the war of the League of the Public Weal. For it seems that some time before Francis had received letters from England informing him that Louis had remarked to the English—probably at Hesdin the year before—that there were two or three powerful men in his kingdom whom he meant to reduce to subjection if he had to get the king of England to help him to do so; and as Francis and Charles had no doubt that they were the men Louis referred to, these two reputed friends of the house of Lancaster had made up their minds to forestall the king of France by forming an alliance with Edward themselves.[1] In June Louis not only had been complaining because the men of St. Malo were seizing English ships in spite of his truce with Edward, but had been expressing great surprise and displeasure at a report, probably started by the request Cousinot had brought to Francis from Henry VI, that the Earl of Pembroke was raising an army in Brittany for a descent on Wales.[2] And yet even at that moment Francis, who on his side was accusing Louis of an intention to purchase an alliance with Edward against him by the surrender of Normandy and Guienne, or at least of marrying his daughter to Edward's brother Clarence and giving her Guienne or Normandy, or some part of them, as a wedding gift,[3] was covertly seeking to secure Edward's support; and the Count of Charolais was aiding him.

---

[1] Chastellain, V, 25; itinerary of Louis XI.

[2] Scofield, *ut sup.*

[3] Itinéraire de Philippe le Bon.

[4] Scofield, *ut sup.*

As early as 30th May Edward had granted a safeconduct for William, Bastard of Brittany, the nephew of a former Duke of Brittany, Francis I.[4] The Bastard of Brittany came to England disguised as a pilgrim journeying to the shrine of Thomas à Becket, but when his pilgrimage was accomplished, he still lingered in England, and Edward was very glad to have him do so. Later, on

---

[1] Chastellain, V, 6-7. Compare a statement in Robert Neville's letter to Whetehill and also some instructions given by Francis to one of his councillors. Commynes-Dupont, III, 213; Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 111-112.

[2] Lettres de Louis XI, II, 196.

[3] Cal. Milanese Papers, *ut sup.* Louis described this story as "mauvaises et seditieuses paroles" (Lettres de Louis XI, X, 220-221), and yet at the beginning of the year he had been hoping for *two* marriages with the house of York. Mandrot, Dépêches, II, 10.

[4] Rymer, XI, 525. The Bastard was a son of Giles of Brittany, murdered in April, 1450. Alain Bouchart, Les Grandes Croniques de Bretaigne, III, 201. More than once in the English records the Bastard's name is incorrectly given as Edward. See Receipt Roll, Mich. 8 Edw. IV, 3rd Nov., and Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 185.

8th July, Edward granted a safeconduct for Jean de la Porte, "esquire of the esquirie of our cousin, the Earl of Charolais," and before La Porte went home, presented him with twenty-five marks, probably to defray his expenses while in England.[1] Finally, about the beginning of August, there appeared in England two brothers of the Dominican order who had come over from Brittany "for certain secret matters" and on whom Edward bestowed ten pounds.[2] These pretended friars were, in reality, Jean de Rouville, Francis II's vice-chancellor, and Jean de Launay, Francis's confessor; and on 12th August Edward empowered the Earl of Worcester and others to treat with them for a truce between England and Brittany. A year's truce, to begin on the first day of October, was soon agreed upon, and on 3rd September William Hatclyf was sent to treat further with Francis and found the situation in Brittany so big with possibilities that he stayed there till the end of the following January.[3]

Louis did not remain long in ignorance of the dealings of Francis and Charles with Edward. News of them came to him from Scotland, if from no other source, before the summer was over, as not long after the return home of the Scottish ambassadors who had negotiated the truce with the English at York and of whom the Bishop of Glasgow had been one, William Monypenny went over to France again to make another report to Louis about the state of affairs in England and Scotland. The Scottish ambassadors, Monypenny then told Louis, had brought back word that the Duke of Brittany had sent an embassy to England. The English themselves had told the ambassadors this, and also that the duke had asked for six thousand archers to assist him in case the king of France should make war on him and had offered in return free passage through all his domains whenever King Edward might choose to invade France. There had been many altercations between the Breton ambassadors and King Edward's commissioners, Monypenny said, but in the end Francis had been promised three thousand archers under the command of Lord Montagu, Lord Scales, and the Earl of Douglas. Montagu, however, the Scottish ambassadors had learned, had refused the offered command because his brother, the Earl of Warwick, objected to his leaving England.

---

[1] Warrants under the Signet, file 1377, 8th July; French Roll 4 Edw. IV, m. 15; Tellers' Roll, Mich. 4 Edw. IV. La Porte apparently came again in the following spring and received the same reward. Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 11th May; Tellers' Roll, Easter 5 Edw. IV. At the time of his first visit he may have been accompanied by Philip of Burgundy's keeper of the jewels, who was granted a safeconduct just before his was granted. French Roll 4 Edw. IV, m. 17; Signed Bills, file 1494, no. 3999.

[2] Tellers' Roll, Mich. 4 Edw. IV.

[3] Morice, III, 86; Lettres de Louis XI, XI, 217; Rymer, XI, 531, 532, 536-537; Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 13th June. Hatclyf was paid 20*s*. a day for the whole period of his absence, 150 days.

To add to Louis' discomfort, Monypenny informed him that the Bishop of Glasgow had also reported to James III and his council that the Englishmen who had been at Hesdin in the preceding year had told him that the king of France had declared to them, while they were there, that he cared so little about the Scots that, if he succeeded in making an agreement with King Edward and if the king of Scots refused to do homage to the king of England as he ought to do, he himself would help Edward to conquer Scotland. This, said Monypenny, had excited the suspicion and anger of King James, his lords, and all Scotland against the king of France, and in consequence James's councillors had arranged with the English that, in case the Earl of Warwick went to France, a Scotsman "bien entendu," who would pretend to be an Englishman, should accompany him in order to report to James and his council all that the king of France might say to the English about Scotland. Monypenny also stated that the English had again offered the Scots a "grand mariage," that the Count of Charolais had also suggested a marriage between James and his daughter, and that the Bishop of Galloway was going to be sent to France to demand the surrender of the county of Saintonge to the king of Scotland in fulfilment of a promise made by Charles VII to James I at the time Louis, then Dauphin of France, married James's daughter Margaret.[1] Finally, when he had given Louis all these bits of news to ponder, the Bishop of St. Andrews's envoy—for such Monypenny really was—advised him to send an embassy of "gens aimés et congnus" to Scotland and, in the meantime, to write in haste to the bishop and encourage him to believe that he would soon have satisfactory news from France.[2]

Louis tried not to be alarmed by what Monypenny had told him. He tried to believe that Francis II had not actually accomplished anything with Edward.[1] Nevertheless, he decided to seize the duke's envoys as they were coming home from England and force them to tell him the whole truth. Feeling sure that, before returning to Brittany, Rouville and Launay would go to see the Count of Charolais, who was staying at Gorcum, in Holland, he dispatched the Bastard of Rubempré, an adventurer who at one time had been in the service of the Duke of Burgundy, to the coast of Holland to waylay the Breton ambassadors at sea. But unluckily for Louis, the Bastard's suspicious behaviour led to his arrest, and the Count of Charolais, remembering how only a few months before Louis had violated his own safeconduct by arresting Philip of Bresse, the son of the Duke of Savoy,[2] believed, or pretended to believe, that he himself was to have been seized and carried off, or perhaps even assassinated. General alarm was felt for the safety of the count and even for that of his father, and Louis quickly discovered not only that his trick had failed, but that it had increased Philip's distrust of him and brought about a reconciliation between the duke and his son, which was the last thing he desired. In the meantime, too, Rouville and Launay had reached home in safety, and although Francis afterwards assured Louis that his only purpose in sending them to England had been to secure an authentic copy of the truce between France and England, so that he might know beyond a doubt whether he and his subjects were included in it, and to appease the "grande colère" which Edward cherished against him because he favoured the Lancastrian party in England and for a long time had given shelter to the Earl of Pembroke,[3] the fact remains that Rouville took home with him Edward's acceptance of a separate truce with Brittany, as well as the promise of three thousand archers of which Monypenny had heard.

---

[1] Cf. Beaucourt, II, 399.

[2] Legrand collections, MS. français 6970, ff. 185-187—a document which is entitled "C'est le raport et la creance de Messire Guillaume de Menypeny," and which, though without date, undoubtedly belongs to the year 1464. (See Appendix V.).

Louis had another reason for feeling uneasy; for while he was trying to find out what was going on between Edward and Francis, the first day of October came and went and, although both he and Philip waited in expectancy, Edward failed to send any ambassadors to the diet appointed to be held at St. Omer. About the first of September an envoy arrived from England to protest against the seizure of four Flemish ships laden with valuable merchandise belonging to Englishmen, and Louis, who was profuse in his promises of reparation, was much struck by the fact that in the letter of credence the man brought to him from the chancellor of England, Warwick's brother, he was addressed, quite contrary to the English custom, as "Serenissimo Francorum regi." By this time a report that Edward was married was beginning to circulate, but few were inclined to credit it, and, although Philip was growing very sceptical about Warwick's coming and finally declared that it would be beneath his dignity to wait for the earl beyond the end of the month, Louis continued to believe that Warwick would attend the diet at St. Omer and that peace would then be signed and the marriage between Edward and Bona of Savoy be definitely agreed on. Louis' heart was now so set on a treaty of peace with England that the Milanese ambassador decided that Warwick, if he did come, would be able to get anything he wanted from the French king. And when, about the middle of September, a messenger from Edward appeared and declared that Warwick would come at the end of September or the beginning of October, Louis presented the bearer of this most welcome news with more than six hundred crowns' worth of velvet and several times invited him to his own table.

---

[1] The writer of the letter to the Count of Maine (?) says that Louis knew that the vice-chancellor of Brittany was in England but that he felt no anxiety on that account, as he had "le scelle du Roy d'Angleterre de ne prandre aucunes alliances ne autres intelligences avec aucun ou aucunes de ses subgiets." If Edward had actually given such a promise as this, he had concealed the fact so carefully that there is no other record of it.

[2] Philip of Bresse was arrested in April, 1464, and was not set at liberty until March, 1466.

[3] Morice, III, 35-38, 86-89.

Yet after all, Warwick did not appear, and on 4th October an Englishman who had arrived in France a few days before and who was brought before Louis, stated that there was no more talk in England of Warwick's crossing the sea and that the earl was with King Edward some forty miles from London. Louis asked the man if they were not looking for Warwick's arrival at Calais, but he said no, and repeated that there was no more talk of the earl's leaving England. To the rumour of Edward's marriage was now added a story that Edward and Warwick had quarrelled; but whether this was true or not no one knew, and Louis, though his confidence was beginning to weaken, would not yet admit that the English had been deceiving him, as his courtiers, most of whom were Angevin in their political sympathies, kept telling him. At the same time he let the Milanese ambassador know secretly that if it turned out to be true that a rupture had occurred between Edward and Warwick, he would take Warwick's part, and that he could count on the aid of the two brothers of the Duke of Somerset.

By degrees the rumours from England grew into a definite assertion that King Edward, to the displeasure of his people, had married the niece of the Count of St. Pol; but Louis remained incredulous and lingered at Abbeville in the hope that Warwick would yet come.[1] In the meantime, however, Philip had sent one Henriet to Calais and thence to England to enquire why the English ambassadors had not arrived. When Henriet came back, he brought the explanation that Louis' arrest of Philip of Bresse and his attempt against the Count of Charolais at Gorcum had frightened the English, and that as for the marriage of Edward and Bona of Savoy, it was of no use to talk about that any more, as the king of England was already married.[2] As late as 8th October Louis was still clinging to hope, but by the 10th he knew the truth, and it was then officially acknowledged at his court that Edward had wedded an English lady.[3]

Louis had indeed received a blow. Nor did his troubles come singly; for at the same time that he lost the hoped-for alliance with England, Philip of Burgundy found him out. Philip had taken great umbrage at what he regarded as the excessive cordiality of Louis' reception of the English messenger—King Edward's "swineherd," as the duke called him—who had come in September; and one day when he was indulging in a tirade on the subject and one of his chamberlains tried to calm him by saying that what he had heard about Louis' inviting the man to his own table and addressing him as "Monseigneur" might not be true, he silenced his admonisher by showing him a letter from Louis to Edward in which Louis assured the English king of his desire to conclude a peace with him in order that he might be free to exterminate the Duke of Brittany and the Count of Charolais. This letter explained why, just before this, Philip had irritated Louis by suddenly leaving Hesdin and going to Lille to meet his son, and as it was Edward himself who had sent the letter to the duke, the plain deduction was that the king of England was really much more of a friend of the Burgundian duke than of the French king, that he was even glad to increase the existing ill-feeling between Louis and the nobles of France, and that altogether the chance of a peace between England and France was very slight indeed.[4]

---

[1] Mandrot, Dépêches, II, 231-232, 237-238, 260-262, 274-276.

[2] Chastellain, V, 93-94.

[3] Mandrot, Dépêches, II, 282, 292.

[4] Mandrot, Dépêches, II, 299-300. Cf. Du Clercq., liv. V, c. xviii and xxiii.

In the early part of August Edward had held an important meeting of his council at Stamford to consider the condition of the currency.[1] On 14th September he met his council again at Reading for further discussion of the same subject, and it was at this second council meeting that he at last made known what he had done on May Day morning. His subjects had long wondered why he did not marry and were afraid that he was not "chaste of his living," and now when Warwick and Wenlock were to start for St. Omer in a few days, his councillors, unable to understand his hesitation, urged him to consent to the marriage which it was known Louis would propose and which would insure a lasting peace with France. The king thus found himself driven into a corner whence he could see no way of escape, as to send Warwick off on another wild-goose chase to the continent was more than he dared to do. So in the presence of his council he very reluctantly made his confession.[2]

The king's announcement caused "great displeasure to many great lords, and especially to the larger part of all his council," said Wenlock in a letter which he wrote to Lannoy from Reading on 3rd October;[3] but as the marriage was a *fait accompli*, the only thing to do was to accept and make the best of it. On Michaelmas Day Elizabeth Woodville was escorted into the chapel of Reading Abbey by the Duke of Clarence and the Earl of Warwick and there by all present was honoured as queen.[4] Edward sought to mollify Warwick by translating the earl's brother from the bishopric of Exeter to the archbishopric of York,[5] but the peace-offering was utterly insufficient. Warwick was extremely wroth, as well he might be, and he also got a foretaste of what the future had in store for him and for all the king's old and tried friends when, immediately after the announcement of the king's marriage, came that of the betrothal of one of the new queen's sisters to Lord Maltravers, son and heir of the Earl of Arundel.[1] What the trend of Elizabeth Woodville's ambition would be was thus promptly made manifest, and it was quite evident also that Edward was too infatuated to remember or care that his wife's father and brother, as well as her former husband, had fought against the house of York. What could possibly be more galling to the man who felt that he had made Edward king?

---

[1] Edward was at Stamford from 7th to 11th August. Afterwards he went to Ludlow. Household Accounts. John Dynham, Chief Justice Markham, and Hugh Fenne, under-treasurer of England, were all rewarded for attending the council meeting at Stamford. Warrants for Issues, 4 Edw. IV, 9th Aug., and 5 Edw. IV, 23rd March; Issue Roll, Easter 4 Edw. IV, 7th May.

[2] Gregory, 226-227.

[3] Waurin, II, 326, note. For proof that Wenlock's letter was addressed to Lannoy, see Plancher, IV, ccxlix.

[4] Worcester, 783. Cf. Hist. Croy. Cont., 551.

[5] Rymer, XI, 533; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 327, 329. The papal bull confirming Neville's election to the archbishopric did not reach England until the following summer. It was published in York Cathedral on 4th June, 1465. Drake, Eboracum, 444.

No small part of Warwick's chagrin was due to a fear that to certain French eyes it would look as if Edward had made a fool of him; and he at once sent letters to Louis and Philip explaining why he was still in England instead of at St. Omer, while Wenlock wrote the letter to Lannoy which told of the displeasure of the king's councillors, and which Lannoy immediately forwarded to Louis.[2] Unfortunately Warwick's letters have disappeared. But in the one he wrote to Louis he stated, according to Louis himself, that he and Edward were on bad terms, and also that he hoped to send in a few days one of his secretaries with news which would be pleasing to the king of France; and not only did Louis draw from the letter the conclusion that Warwick desired to make himself king of England, but he told the Milanese ambassador that he believed the earl would succeed and that, as he considered him one of his best friends, he was inclined to help him.[3] As for Wenlock, who had special reasons of his own for feeling disappointed at the turn events had taken, since all hope of his promised reward from Louis had vanished, he announced to Lannoy that, in as much as the king's marriage had changed the entire situation and his councillors did not yet know what he meant to do about the other matter which was to have been discussed at St. Omer, namely, the truce or peace between England and France, in their opinion it would be better for Warwick not to cross the sea until the king had made his wishes definitely known. Wenlock added, however, with little consideration for the truth, that both Edward and his subjects wanted a treaty of peace with France and that as soon as the king's intentions were known, Warwick would depart for St. Omer at once. Yet Wenlock's faith in Louis was not perfect. He warned Lannoy that it had been reported at the council meeting that the king of France had attempted

---

[1] Worcester. The marriage did not take place until early in 1466. Paston Letters, IV, 217.

[2] Lannoy received Wenlock's letter on 13th October, in the evening, and sent it to Louis the next day. Plancher, *ut sup.*

[3] Mandrot, Dépêches, II, 304-305.

"many great things" to the prejudice of the Duke of Burgundy and the Count of Charolais, that he had taken Queen Margaret's friend Brezé into great favour, and that he had seized and imprisoned the Duke of Savoy.[1] These things sounded very strange to English ears, Wenlock said, and the council was so disturbed by the statements of a man (Pierre Puissant) who had been captured recently by the garrison of Hammes, that it had been decided to send the man to France and let Louis know all that was being said to his discredit.[2]

Warwick and Wenlock were not the only persons who had been interested in the St. Omer diet and who were concerned about its postponement or failure. All English merchants having business connections with the Netherlands were also feeling very uneasy, as the commercial treaty between England and Burgundy would expire on the first day of November, unless steps were taken to prolong it. At last Thomas Rygby, sub-sheriff of London, was sent to the king to remind him of the situation, and when thus brought to his senses, Edward made haste to do what he could. On 19th October the king wrote to the chancellor that he had received letters from the mayor and aldermen of London declaring "how that it were right behoveful, expedient, and necessary that the intercourse of merchandise between us and our cousin, the Duke of Burgundy, were prorogued as for a season," and that in consequence he had written to Lord Wenlock and Master Thomas Kent to "devise a gentle letter in French to our cousin, the French king, for prorogation of the same"; and he directed the chancellor to draw up a commission for Richard Whetehill and William Caxton, merchant, "for conveying of the same letters to the said duke."[3]

The efforts of Whetehill and Caxton resulted in an agreement, signed on 27th October, that the intercourse of merchandise between England and Burgundy should continue in force for another year and as much longer as was pleasing to both parties, and that neither party should denounce it without giving forty days' notice.[1] But just before he signed this agreement, Philip of Burgundy dealt a heavy and unexpected blow to the cloth merchants of England which Caxton, who, though he is remembered to-day only as England's first printer, was at that time a wealthy mercer residing at Bruges and governor of the English merchants in the Netherlands, must have striven hard to avert.

---

[1] A mistake, of course, for the son of the Duke of Savoy. Brezé had recently been made grand seneschal of Normandy again. Chastellain, V, 88.

[2] Waurin, *ut sup.* For proof that the man taken by the garrison of Hammes was Pierre Puissant, see Robert Neville's letter. Commynes-Dupont, III, 215-216. When brought face to face with Louis' officers, Puissant denied all that he had previously stated. He was a citizen of Bruges, and in after years he served as secretary to Maximilian of Austria. We shall hear of him again, as Maximilian sent him to England more than once.

[3] Warrants under the Signet, file 1379. The commission for Whetehill and Caxton to treat with the Duke of Burgundy for the prorogation of the intercourse of merchandise was drawn up on the following day. Rymer, XI, 536. Apparently Louis was to be written to as the Duke of Burgundy's overlord. But it is a curious fact that Edward should feel called upon to write to the king of France about such a thing as a prolongation of a treaty between England and Burgundy.

The growth of England's cloth trade had long been regarded by the cloth manufacturing towns of the Netherlands as a serious menace to their prosperity, and it was for their sakes that Philip had several times stirred the wrath of English merchants by prohibiting the sale of English cloth and yarn in his territories, and even the passage of such goods through his lands to other markets. Each time, however, this prohibition had proved so detrimental to the commerce of the Netherlands that it had soon been revoked,[2] and now, for some years past, English cloth merchants had been plying their trade in Philip's domains without hindrance. But if the English merchants flattered themselves that the failure of past attempts to shut them out, and also the close friendship which seemed to exist between their king and the Duke of Burgundy, insured them against such molestation in the future, they were destined to be disappointed. For the towns of Brabant, Flanders, and Holland had suffered in their turn from the restrictions which the English parliament had recently put upon importations into England and upon the exportation of raw wool from England by foreign merchants, and they finally appealed to Philip for help. They told the duke both that the importation of English cloth was destructive to their cloth industry and that, as the English not only demanded an excessive price for their raw wool, now that the home demand for it was so great, but would accept nothing except gold or silver bullion in payment for it, all the bullion of his domains was flowing into England; and the duke, heeding their cry, on

---

[1] On 21st November Edward told the chancellor to draw up letters patent to this effect and to date them 27th October. Signed Bills, file 1496, no. 4055. Philip signed this agreement at Lille on 28th October. Palgrave, Kalendars of the Exchequer, II, 204.

[2] Pirenne, Hist. de Belgique, II, 228, 383; Stein, Die Merchant Adventurers in Utrecht, Hansische Geschichtsblätter, 1899, p. 180; Schanz, Englische Handelspolitik, II, 657-660.

26th October once more forbade the bringing of English cloth and yarn into his lands and territories. The blow was as sudden as it was severe, and all that the angry but helpless English cloth merchants could do was to withdraw to Utrecht, where, happily, the value of their presence was recognized and they were received with open arms.[1]

Philip's unfriendly, but not altogether unprovoked act was bitterly resented in England, and it revived the old feeling against him which the treaty of Arras had excited thirty years before and which, though slumbering, had never really died. England's interests were inextricably bound up with those of the Netherlands, and every thoughtful and open-minded Englishman realized the fact; but the close alliance with Burgundy on which Edward had thus far based his whole foreign policy, and to which he owed in no small degree his victory over the house of Lancaster, was endured as a necessary evil rather than rejoiced in, and the fresh offence which Philip had now given made it, though not less indispensable, distinctly galling. Unluckily, too, all this happened just when Warwick's feet were becoming entangled in Louis' web. Deeply incensed by what Edward had done, Warwick found Louis' attentions more and more soothing, and though he should have understood his fellow countrymen well enough to know that they would follow the path of common sense even when they found it rough and swore they would bear it no longer, he allowed himself to be deceived by the dislike many persons expressed for Philip and his subjects into thinking that he could lead England into an alliance with France even at the cost, if necessary, of her alliance with Burgundy. He also deceived himself in regard to the amount of opposition Edward would offer and in consequence brought great trouble not only upon himself, but upon all England. For in this way began the struggle between Warwick and Louis XI on the one hand, and Edward and the ruler of Burgundy on the other, which was to culminate in the battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury.

The "gentle letter in French" devised by Wenlock and Kent was carried to Louis by Robert Neville, a cousin of the Earl of Warwick. Neville found the French king at Rouen,[2] and if Louis cherished ill-will against Edward for deceiving him about his marriage, that did not prevent him from welcoming Warwick's cousin with "grand chiere" and handsome gifts or from expressing cordial affection for the earl. Neville, who was also carrying letters from Edward and Warwick to Philip of Burgundy, had to ask three or four times for permission to depart before Louis could make up his mind to let him go. But at last he succeeded in bidding Louis farewell, and about the middle of November he delivered his letters to Philip at Lille. By this time all plans for the St. Omer diet had been dropped and Louis had sent, or was about to send, the Seigneur de la Barde or the Seigneur de la Rozière, or both, to England to straighten matters out;[1] but Philip, as well as Louis, was greatly disappointed by Warwick's failure to come to the diet, and to Neville he talked very little about Edward but a great deal about the earl.[2]

---

[1] Gachard, Collection de documents inédits concernant l'histoire de la Belgique (Brussels, 1833-1835), II, 176-182; Stein, op. cit., 181-182. Cf. Rolls of Parl., V, 565. Philip's decree on this occasion was a literal repetition of that of 1434.

[2] Neville arrived at Rouen on 23rd October. Mandrot, Dépêches, II, 323.

If Louis seemed ready to forgive Edward for rejecting the marriage he had offered him for the sake of one which all the world regarded as both indiscreet and bizarre,[3] it was because he was afraid of what the Duke of Brittany and the Count of Charolais might be planning. As the unfortunate incident at Gorcum had united Philip and his son, Louis had more cause than ever to dread the plottings of Francis and Charles, and it was so essential to his safety that the king of England should not be drawn into their league that he dared not let Edward imagine he had taken offence. Neville reported, after his visit to Rouen, that the vice-chancellor of Brittany had misrepresented the state of affairs when he was in England. As a matter of fact, Neville said, Francis II had been frightened into submission by the opposition of all the noblemen of his duchy and by the arrival of a thousand of Louis' soldiers on his borders, and he had sent to assure Louis that, as for the English, he did not love them, never had loved them, and never would love them unless forced to, and that he had entered into negotiations with them only because of his understanding that Louis had invited Edward and Warwick to assist in destroying him "de corps et de biens."[1] Nevertheless, on the first day of November Francis confirmed the truce which Rouville and Launay had signed with Edward,[2] and all the time William Hatclyf was at his court and the Bastard of Brittany at the English court. On the last day of November Edward sent two warrants to the treasurer of England, one telling him to pay to the Bastard of Brittany or his deputy three hundred marks sterling "by us to him granted in fee," the other ordering him to deliver to John Pegier three hundred bows "which we have given unto Master John de Rouville, vice-chancellor of Bretaigne."[3]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, II, 330; Legrand's history, MS. français, 6960, f. 658. Neville wrote that Louis was sending to England "ung très saige chevalier, et est grant homme en la maison de France."

[2] See Neville's letter, written at Lille on 17th November and addressed to Whetehill. Commynes-Dupont, III, 211-217. Neville was paid £20 for his journey to France. Tellers' Roll, Mich. 4 Edw. IV.

[3] A passage in Caspar Weinreich's Danziger Chronik (Scriptores Rerum Prussicarum, IV, 769) is an interesting illustration of the gossip about Edward's marriage.

Louis may not have known all these things, but he knew or suspected enough. And in December he summoned the nobles of France to Tours to obtain from them a solemn condemnation of Francis's perfidy.

The council meeting at Reading in September, 1464, has become famous owing to Edward's announcement of his marriage, but it had been called for a very different purpose, which, though by no means so picturesque, calls for some mention.

Acting on the theory generally accepted at that period that the wealth of a country was determined by the amount of the precious metals it contained, Edward's predecessors had made repeated efforts to prevent the exportation of gold and silver, whether in the form of coined money, bullion, or plate, from England. In spite of all such precautions, however, and notwithstanding the assertion of the Duke of Burgundy's subjects that all the bullion of his domains was flowing into Edward's kingdom, too little gold and silver was being brought to the king's mints for coinage, and the year 1464 was marked by a great scarcity of money in England.[4] This state of affairs was brought to the notice of the king's advisers at the council meeting held at Stamford at the beginning of August, and it was then decided that greater inducements must be offered to those who owned silver to bring it to the Tower for coinage. Heretofore a pound weight of silver had yielded 30*s.* and the man who brought it to the mint had received 29*s.*, while the king kept the remaining shilling for seignorage and coinage. But at the Stamford council meeting it was decreed that henceforth the pound weight of silver should yield 37*s.* 6*d.*, and that the man who brought it to the mint should receive 33*s.*, the king retaining 4*s.* 6*d.* On 13th August a royal proclamation announced this change, explained that it had been made because of the great scarcity of money in the king's realm, " which of very likelihood, amongst other, is for lack of bringing in of bullion into his mints, and that is because, as it is conceived, that those that should bring bullion may have more in other princes' mints for their bullion than in his," and told the owner of silver that by the new arrangement he would receive " more than he did before in every ounce by 4*d.* and in all in the pound by 4*s.*"[1]

---

[1] Neville's letter. Cf. Chastellain, V, 75, 77-78, who says that the English themselves had informed Francis that Louis had sought their help "contre luy et pour le desfaire avecques aucuns autres."

[2] Rymer, XI, 536; Palgrave, Kalendars of the Exchequer, III, 10.

[3] Warrants for Issues, 4 Edw. IV, 30th Nov. On Tellers' Rolls, Mich. 4 Edw. IV, and Easter 5 Edw. IV, no. 35, are entered two payments of £32 16*s.* 8*d.* each to the Bastard of Brittany in pursuance of the above grant. The second of these rolls also contains references to three hundred bows bought by Nicholas Wydower, king's bowyer, and given to the Bastard. These may be the bows that had been promised to Rouville.

[4] Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 80.

On the day on which this proclamation went forth Lord Hastings, who had held the office of master of the mint since May, 1461,[2] signed an indenture with the king by which he undertook to coin three kinds of gold pieces, the noble, which was to be worth 6*s.* 8*d.* (as it had been since 1412), the half-noble, which was to be worth 3*s.* 4*d.*, and the farthing, which was to be worth 20*d.*; and five kinds of silver pieces, the groat, to be worth 4*d.*, the half-groat, the penny, the half-penny, and the farthing. Every pound of gold of the Tower weight (5400 grains Troy) was to be worth £16 13*s.* 4*d.* (50 nobles), and every pound of silver 37*s.* 6*d.*, as fixed by the proclamation of 13th August.[3]

But the silver coinage could not be debased without affecting the gold coinage also, and it was to decide what changes ought to be made in the values given to the gold coins circulating in the kingdom that the council was summoned to meet again at Reading.

---

[1] Signed Bills, file 1495, no. 4018. Cf. London Letter Book L, f. 31b, and Hist. MSS Com., Report 8, app., 60.

[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 130.

[3] For proof that this was the original reading of the indenture with Hastings, see Writs of Privy Seal, file 799, no. 1468, which is a warrant from the king dated Reading, 29th September, and directing the chancellor to alter the reading. The chancellor was told to make the alterations in the warrant previously sent to him, in the indentures themselves, " and also in the enrollments of the same." Consequently, though the entry on the Patent Roll (Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 370), is dated 13th August, the values given to the gold coins are those fixed by the council at Reading in September.

The decision reached by the council was announced in another proclamation "for the increase and multiplication of our coin," which was issued on 28th September. In this second proclamation that of 13th August was repeated, and it was then stated that at the end of fifteen days every noble would be current at 8*s.* 4*d.*, instead of at 6*s.* 8*d.*, as heretofore, the half-noble at 4*s.* 2*d.*, and the gold farthing at 2*s.* 1*d.*, while, as in the past, three groats, twelve pennies, or forty-eight farthings would make a shilling, twenty shillings a pound, and 13*s.* 4*d.* a mark.[1] At the same time the chancellor was directed to make the necessary alterations in the indenture so recently made with Lord Hastings.[2]

When telling his subjects of these changes in the gold coins, Edward assured them that he was acting for their good and after "long, sad, and ripe deliberation and communications had with men of great wisdom and experience, as well as merchants as other"; and he invited any person who thought the changes were not wise, "but rather a loss and hurt," to come before him or his council and declare his reasons. He promised that if the reasons were found to be good, he would not only provide a proper remedy, but would give him who offered them "right a good thank" for his pains.

But the king hardly looked for the response he got. He gained largely himself by what had been done, as every owner of coins had to hurry to the mint and have them recoined, which meant greatly increased profits from seignorage and coinage.[3] But the displeasure excited was great. "At the beginning of this money," wrote one who was living at the time, "many men groched passing sore, for they could not reckon that gold not so quickly as they did the old gold. And men might go throughout a street, or through a whole parish, or that he might change it. And some men said that the new gold was not so good as the old gold was, for it was alloyed."[4] Consequently so many persons were ready to earn "right a good thank" by proving that a mistake had been made that in a few months another change was decreed. On 6th April,

---

[1] Writs of Privy Seal, file 799, no. 1464; Close Roll 4 Edw. IV, m. 20; Archæologia, XII, 404-406. Cf. Worcester, 783.

[2] See note above.

[3] See Ramsey, II, 313. On 8th November, 1464, Edward gave orders that all profits from the exchange at the Tower should be delivered to the treasurer of his household for the expenses of the household, and Sir John Fogge received £4,856 16*s.* 2*d.* for the period running from 1st September 4 Edw. IV to Michaelmas 6 Edw. IV. Exchequer Accounts, Mint, bundle 294, no. 18.

[4] Gregory, 227. Cf. Cal. Venetian Papers, I, 114, and Mandrot, Dépêches, II, 304.

1465, a third proclamation announced that, as the king had learned that the enhancing of the value of the noble had caused " difficulty in reckoning and accounts," especially among " the poor and simple commoners of this land," he had decided, at the request of many persons in divers parts of the realm and by the advice of his council, to issue five new " moneys of gold," to wit, the " new noble of gold,"[1] of which the pound of gold was to yield forty-five and which was to be worth 10*s.*; the half-noble, worth 5*s.*; the farthing of gold, worth 2*s.* 6*d.*; the angel (so called because it was to have an angel stamped on it), worth 6*s.* 8*d.*, and the angelet, worth 3*s.* 4*d.* Special facilities for the exchange of the old coins for the new ones were also offered, the king ordering exchanges to be kept at Norwich, Coventry, and Bristol, as well as at the Tower of London.[2]

But nothing that the king could do could insure the bringing to his mints of all the bullion that came into England or prevent altogether the carrying of money out of the realm. The royal searchers stationed at the ports of England made many a seizure of money and of gold and silver plate which the owners were trying to smuggle out of the kingdom, and among the would-be smugglers who were caught in the act was one very august person. On 18th May, 1465, Edward directed the treasurer and chamberlains of the Exchequer to pay a reward of forty pounds to William Baldry, searcher in the port of London, for seizing one hundred and thirty pounds of coined money " belonging to our adversary, Lowes of France, ready to be carried over the sea against our laws, as is said." But because it was not wise to offend the king of France for so small a matter, Edward also announced that, by the advice of his council, he had "granted and given to John de Shenes, factor to the said Lowes, to the use of the same Lowes, the said sum of money."[3]

---

[1] The new noble came to be known both as the " royal," a name borrowed from the French, and, because of the rose stamped on it, as the " rose noble." Kenyon, Gold Coins of Eng., 57-58.

[2] Signed Bills, file 1497, no. 4111. Commissions for the taking of coiners, etc., for the mints at Norwich, Coventry, and Bristol were issued on 6th July, 1465. Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 446. The mint at Norwich seems to have come to an end with Edward's reign. Records of the City of Norwich, II, cxliv.

[3] Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 18th May. For other seizures, see some of Baldry's accounts in Customs Accounts, Divers Ports, 186/1—186/7, and also a treasurer's account in Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 1st March.

CHAPTER II

THE CORONATION OF ELIZABETH WOODVILLE AND THE CAPTURE OF HENRY VI

EDWARD and his bride spent several weeks in the monastery at Reading after the council meeting ended[1] and, probably to give time for the storm raised by the announcement of the marriage to die down, parliament was prorogued again. Three persons, Warwick, Northumberland, and Greystock, received commissions to go to York on 26th November and adjourn the parliament until 21st January; but as Northumberland and Greystock were sent to Carlisle at the beginning of November to meet an embassy from James III which was coming to treat for a perpetual peace with England or a further extension of the truce, Warwick had to perform the errand at York. The only excuse the king offered for the adjournment was that it was impossible for him to come to York.[2]

The last day of November found the king and queen at Windsor. On 8th December, however, they went to Eltham, and on that day Edward commanded the treasurer and chamberlains of the Exchequer to pay £466 13*s.* 4*d.* "to our right entirely well beloved wife, the queen, for the expenses of her chamber, wardrobe, and stable against this feast of Christmas next coming." Permanent provision was made for the queen about the same time, when the great council was summoned to Westminster and lands worth four thousand marks a year were given to her. After a few months the king also granted her his "manor of pleasance in Greenwich," and ultimately his manor of Shene as well.[3]

The honeymoon Christmas was celebrated at Eltham, and Edward distributed two hundred and seven pounds' worth of gift-rings.

---

[1] Privy Seals.

[2] Writs of Privy Seal, file 800, no. 1508; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 359; Rymer, XI, 535; Rolls of Parl., V, 500.

[3] Warrants for Issues, 4 Edw. IV, 8th Dec.; Worcester, 783; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 430, 433, 445, 480, 525.

But early in January he returned to Westminster Palace to be ready for the opening of parliament.[1]

This time the Commons were not asked to make a grant to the king. But another resumption act was passed, and tunnage and poundage and the wool subsidy, which up to this time Edward had been collecting without other authority than the grant made to Henry VI in 1453, were given to him for his "life natural." The resumption act, however, applied only to ancient crown lands, to the duchy of Lancaster and other lands forfeited by Henry, and to the duchy of York and the earldom of March; and it was modified by nearly three hundred exemption clauses. Moreover, while tunnage and poundage were continued at the rates fixed in 1453, that is to say, at 3*s.* on every tun of wine imported into England and 12*d.* on every twenty shillings' worth of merchandise exported or imported, the wool subsidy was reduced from 43*s.* 4*d.* on every sack of wool and every 240 woolfells shipped from England by native merchants, and 100*s.* on every sack of wool and every 240 woolfells shipped by aliens, to 33*s.* 4*d.* from native shippers and 66*s.* 8*d.* from aliens. The rates on hides were also lowered; for while Henry had been granted 100*s.* on the last from native merchants and 106*s.* 8*d.* from aliens, Edward was to have but 66*s.* 8*d.* from native merchants and 73*s.* 4*d.* from aliens.[2] Even when thus reduced the wool duties were practically prohibitive for foreign merchants. But so they were meant to be.

Edward also obtained an act of attainder against the late Sir Ralph Percy and a few other persons, and at the same time the attainders of the Duke of Somerset, Humphrey Neville of Brancepeth, and Sir Henry Bellingham were revived, while the rebels in Harlech Castle and a score of other men were summoned to appear before the justices at Westminster on pain of attainder and forfeiture. Among the men threatened in this way were Somerset's two brothers, Edmund and John Beaufort, both of whom had ultimately been pardoned but had made use of their liberty to flee to Brittany and thence to Queen Margaret.[3] Yet Edward had not lost his inclination to pardon his enemies. His treatment of the Earl of Oxford's son proved that. For though he had taken possession of Oxford's estates after the earl's execution, he had already handed them back to John de Vere, the earl's son, and now that same son secured the reversal of the attainder of his ancestor, Robert de Vere, Duke of Ireland, and thus came into possession of the original earldom of Oxford.[1]

---

[1] Warrants for Issues, 4 Edw. IV, 28th Dec.; Tellers' Roll, Mich. 4 Edw. IV; Privy Seals.

[2] Rolls of Parl., V, 508-509, 514-548. Edward added to the act granting him tunnage and poundage and the wool subsidy a proviso that it was not to affect the Hanseatic merchants, but as nothing was said about the Italian merchants, they must have gone on paying according to the agreement made with them in June, 1463.

[3] *Ibid.*, V, 511-514. Sir John Fortescue, writing to the Earl of Ormond in

The Commons brought in the usual number of petitions concerning the usual variety of matters. For example, they asked that all cordwainers and cobblers plying their trade in London or within three miles of the city should be forbidden to make boots, shoes, or galoshes with pikes more than two inches long, or to sell or "put, set, or do upon any man's feet or legs" the said articles of apparel on Sunday and certain church festivals. And according to Gregory, it was the Pope who was responsible for this petition, as he had sent a bull to England in which he cursed any cordwainer who did these things or went to fairs on a Sunday. But though the law was passed and, Gregory says, proclaimed at Paul's Cross, Englishmen received it as they usually received outside interference. "Some men said that they would wear long pikes whether Pope will or nill, for they said the Pope's curse would not kill a fly. God amend this. And within short time after some of the cordwainers got privy seals and protections to make long pikes, and caused those same men of their craft that laboured to the Pope for the destruction of long pikes to be troubled and in great danger."[2]

There is no need to look for the hand of the Pope in the other petitions presented by the Commons, as it is evident that most of them were prompted by the same desire to protect the native merchant against the encroachments of the foreigner which had dictated so much of the legislation of the earlier session of this parliament. The Commons sought to prevent evasions of the staple regulations by having the exportation of wool, except that going through the straits of Marrok to the Mediterranean, confined to the ports of the realm at which collectors of customs were stationed; they asked that wool grown in certain counties should be

---

December, 1464, said that "my lord of Somerset that now is and his brother" had come to Margaret "from Brittany by Paris through France" with six horses. Clermont, Works of Sir John Fortescue, I, 23.

[1] Rolls of Parl., V, 549; Nicolas, Hist. Peerage, 369.

[2] Rolls of Parl., V, 566; Statute 4 Edw. IV, c. 7; Gregory, 238. Gregory tells this story as if the act of parliament referred to belonged to 1468.

sold only to native yarn or cloth makers; and they wanted the tanners and butchers of London and the neighbourhood to be forbidden to sell unwrought horns to foreigners.[1]

All these petitions seemed to the king not unreasonable, and he gladly gave his assent to them. But the Commons asked for something else which he could not view with approval. They craved revenge for the Duke of Burgundy's recent edict against English cloth and yarn. Not content with the statute of 1463 which had shut out of England many an article formerly imported by Philip's subjects, they wanted all kinds of merchandise, except food, of the "growing, working, or making" of the duke's domains to be excluded until he was brought to reason and revoked his unfriendly decree; and however much Edward may have desired to prevent this further stab at his friend and ally, again he ventured to do no more than add to his assent a proviso that the new statute should continue in force only during his will and pleasure.[2] The royal searchers and escheators were kept busy making seizures of cutlery, pins, girdles, hats, playing cards, tennis balls, feather-beds, bed-covers of "tapestry work," and other articles produced by the deft fingers of the workmen and workwomen of the Netherlands,[3] but it remained in the king's power to put an end to all this whenever he saw fit to do so, and without consulting his subjects.

Luckily Philip could no more afford to quarrel with Edward about pins and hats and feather-beds than Edward could afford to quarrel with Philip about cloth and yarn. For Philip needed Edward as much as Edward needed him, and for the same reason. Both were afraid of the king of France, and both knew that their best protection against him was their mutual alliance. Philip's fear of Louis had grown very gradually, but it was none the less real, while Edward knew that, though the battle of Hexham had left Henry VI only his life and the castle of Harlech, Margaret would go on appealing to Louis for help and that Louis would always grant her help if by so doing he could make trouble in England.

For more than a year past Margaret had been living in a chateau near St. Mighel in Bar which her father had assigned to her use. René had also given her a pension of six thousand crowns, but this was all that she could hope to receive from him.[1] Sir John Fortescue was still with her, acting as her chief adviser and devoting much of his time to the education of her son, and the Duke of Exeter, Doctor John Morton, the Bishop of St. Asaph, whom Edward had deprived of his see,[2] Sir Edmund Mountfort, Sir Edmund Hampden, Sir Robert Whitingham, and other fugitives from England were also sharing her retreat. But Margaret's court was far from luxurious. "We be-eth all in great poverty," wrote Fortescue to the Earl of Ormond, who had fled to Portugal after failing in another attempt to establish himself in his earldom in Ireland,[3] "but yet the queen sustaineth us in meat and drink, so as we be-eth not in extreme necessity. Her Highness may do no more to us than she doth. Wherefore I counsel you spend sparely such money as ye have, for when ye come hither ye shall have need of it. And also here be-eth many that need, and will desire to part with you of your own money; and in all this country is no man that will or may loan you any money, have ye ever so great need."[4]

---

[1] Rolls of Parl., V, 563-566; Statutes 4 Edw. IV, c. 2, 4, and 8.

[2] Rolls of Parl., V, 565-566; Statute 4 Edw. IV, c. 5.

[3] Customs Accounts, Divers Ports, 186/3-187/7; Exchequer L. T. R., Enrolled Accounts, Escheators, no. 75.

In spite of all, however, Margaret's courage and confidence never deserted her. She still looked for ultimate victory, and the moment she heard that Edward had offended Warwick by his secret marriage, her appeals to Louis became almost arrogant in tone. The Milanese ambassador at Louis' court wrote home at the beginning of February: "The queen, wife of King Henry, has written to the king here that she is advised that King Edward and the Earl of Warwick have come to very great division and war together. She begs the king here to be pleased to give her help so that she may be able to recover her kingdom, or at least allow her to receive assistance from the lords of this kingdom who are willing to afford this, and if he will not take anyone of these courses, she writes that she will take the best course that she can. The king remarked, 'Look how proudly she writes.' "[1]

---

[1] Lecoy de la Marche, Le Roi René, I, 344-345; Plummer, Fortescue's Governance of England, 64. Cf. Worcester, 781, and Perceval's article in Archæologia, XLVII. René now had his own grievance against the king of France, as Louis, two months after he signed his truce with Edward, had purchased the renewal of his former league with the Duke of Milan by ceding to Sforza his claims to Genoa. Perret, Relations de la France avec Venise, I, 400-403. This was equivalent to an announcement by Louis that he had deserted the cause of the house of Anjou in Italy, as he seemed to have deserted it in England.

[2] On 28th January, 1463. Le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ.

[3] Gilbert, Viceroys of Ireland, 380; Facsimiles of National MSS. of Ireland, Pt. III, no. xlviii.

[4] Clermont, Works of Sir John Fortescue, I, 23-25.

If Margaret indulged in veiled threats when writing to Louis, it was because she believed that help from another source was already in sight. The Earl of Ormond's letter, telling of his escape from his enemies to Portugal, had been received at the beginning of December, and at once a new plan had taken shape in Margaret's mind. Knowing nothing of the negotiations which the Duke of Brittany and the Count of Charolais were carrying on with Edward, she took it for granted that she could still rely on their friendship; and she told herself that if, in addition to some help from Francis and Charles, she could obtain an army from the king of Portugal or the king of Castile, in the veins of both of whom some of the blood of John of Gaunt flowed,[2] she could accomplish all that she had failed to accomplish when she had only Brezé and a few hundred Frenchmen to aid her.

Despite Edward's refusal of his sister's hand, Henry of Castile was still negotiating with him; for early in the autumn of 1464, apparently at the urging of Ferdinand of Naples, Henry had sent another embassy to England, and when his ambassadors returned home, about the first of November, Bernard de la Forsse had accompanied them.[3] But of these negotiations Margaret was probably ignorant. Or if she heard of them, she also heard that no alliance between Edward and Henry had yet been signed and believed that, until this happened, her chances with Henry were as good as Edward's. As for Alphonso of Portugal, not only had he shown no desire up to the present moment to make friends with Edward, but when Margaret had sent William Joseph[4] to him on some occasion for

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 116.

[2] Henry the Impotent, as has already been stated, was the grandson of Katharine, daughter of John of Gaunt and Constance of Castile, and Alphonso of Portugal was the grandson of Philippa, another daughter of John of Gaunt.

[3] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 113; Writs of Privy Seal, file 803, no. 1656—the king's license, granted on 21st April, 1465, to one Richard Asshe, owner of the *Antony* of Hampton, to import seventy tuns of wine from Guienne without paying customs, because, about All Hallowtide, he had conveyed home divers Spanish ambassadors and, with them, Bernard de la Forsse, the king's ambassador sent to Spain. At the time this license was granted, the *Antony* was still waiting at a Spanish port to bring La Forsse home. La Forsse had received his commission from Edward on 9th October. Rymer, XI, 534.

[4] No doubt the man of that name who had been so conspicuous as Somerset's confederate at the time of the first battle of St. Albans. He probably returned to England with Margaret just before the battle of Tewkesbury and afterwards submitted to Edward, as on 17th December, 1471, he received a general pardon and in 1472 his attainder was reversed. Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 305; Rolls of Parl., VI, 32.

her husband's "matter," he had received her messenger very graciously.

So Fortescue hastened to reply to Ormond's letter and to give him many instructions. As the earl had expressed a wish to come to St. Mighel, Fortescue sent him a certificate from the queen to serve as a safeconduct, but he did so with the remark that a document signed by Brezé would be a better guarantee of a safe journey, as the king of France had made "many appointments with our rebels, by which it seemeth he hath not alway intended to keep the peace and truce which he made with us"; and he bade the earl not to spare to "tarry long" with the king of Portugal, if he found the king "entreatable in our matters." With Fortescue's letter were enclosed one from Margaret and two from the Prince of Wales. The queen's letter and one of the Prince's were intended for their "most dear cousin," the king of Portugal, though their acquaintance with their kinsman was so slight that they "knew not verily" his name. The other letter from the Prince, which was written "with mine own hand, that ye may see how good writer I am," was addressed to "Cousin Ormond" himself, and in it the Prince thanked the earl for his "sad, wise, and manly guiding against my lord's rebels and your adversaries" and prayed him to labour with the king of Portugal for "the furtherance and setting forth of my lord in the recovering of his right and subduing of his rebels."

The instructions which Fortescue sent to Ormond were drawn up with no little skill. First of all, the earl was to thank the queen's cousin of Portugal for the good-will he had always displayed towards the king, her husband, and give him to understand that letters recently received from Henry, sealed with his signet and signed with his own hand, showed him to be in good health and "out of the hands of his rebels and in surety of his person." Then the earl was to tell Alphonso that Margaret relied on him for assistance, partly because of his descent from the house of Lancaster, partly because of the peace and friendship which had so long existed between England and Portugal, and partly because Henry had made him a knight of the Garter, but most of all because he was a Christian king and the wrong which had been done to her husband was "an injury and dishonour to all kings and matter of boldness to all subjects to rebel against their lords, to the peril and unsurety of all princes, if it be not punished." At the same time Alphonso was to be assured that the majority of the people of England were still loyal to Henry, and that the only reason why they did not make their loyalty evident was that they had " no great lord to be their captain." If the queen could get " some notable and manly prince or other captain," Ormond was to say, and with that captain at least three thousand well equipped men who could take the field in the parts of England which her council knew to be best disposed towards the house of Lancaster, this would be all that was necessary—especially if King Henry himself went with the army to draw the people to him. These three thousand men and their captain Alphonso was to be entreated to furnish, and his reward would be that, after the easy victory was won, he would have " at his necessity at his own will the whole might of England to resist and chastise his enemies and to defend and help his friends."

Ormond was also to inform Alphonso that " the chancellor England," which was to say Fortescue, had been given authority to bind the realm of England to repay all sums expended for Henry's cause; and, finally, if Alphonso proved to be "loving and tender to the king's party," he was to ask him to write a few letters on Henry's behalf. The Empress of Germany was Alphonso's sister, and it was hoped that he would write to her and the Emperor requesting them to assist Henry and to try to induce the Pope and the College of Cardinals to do the same. It was hoped, too, that he would write to the Count of Charolais, commending him for the " perseverant kindness " he had shown to Henry and praying him to continue it, and, lastly, to his brother-in-law, the king of Castile, begging him not only to refuse to ally himself with Edward, but to grant Henry's friends the right of free passage through his kingdom. If the kings of Portugal and Castile threw the weight of their influence on the side of the friends of the house of Lancaster, Fortescue told Ormond, they might even " cause us, and themselves by means of us, to make and have a perpetual peace with the realm of France."[1]

It was a beautiful plan, but unluckily the letters and instructions intended for the Earl of Ormond seem to have been intercepted and retained by the king of France. And if new ones were afterwards sent and escaped Louis' far-reaching fingers, they were too late, as in a few months occurred a fresh disaster which seemed to make Henry's restoration to his throne for ever impossible.

---

[1] Clermont, Works of Sir John Fortescue, I, 22-28. See also Archæological Journal, Vol. VII, where some of these despatches are printed from the manuscripts in the Bibliothêque Nationale.

In January, 1465, Philip of Burgundy was entertaining at Brussels some English envoys who came to inform him that the new queen of England was to be crowned on the Sunday before Pentecost and to invite him to send a fitting delegation to represent him on the happy occasion.[1] The duke was not left, however, to send any noblemen he might happen to choose. Since Elizabeth Woodville, on her father's side, was of "assez petite extraction," Edward was very anxious that his subjects should be reminded in some way that her mother, Jacquetta de Luxembourg, Dowager Duchess of Bedford, was descended from a family quite as noble as his own—a family which had furnished kings to Bohemia and emperors to Germany—and to that end he requested Philip to send to his wife's coronation certain kinsmen and friends of Jacquetta de Luxembourg, especially her brother, Jacques de Luxembourg, Seigneur de Richebourg, to whom he had already granted a safeconduct in October.[2] Philip was entirely willing to grant Edward's request, but before Jacquetta de Luxembourg's kinsmen were ready to start for England the duke again became very ill, so ill that the Count of Charolais was able to get rid of the Croys, whose influence over his father he had always violently resented and whom Philip himself had begun to distrust since Edward's revelations regarding what Lannoy had tried to do in England, and to persuade his father to transfer the burdens of government to his shoulders. However, while a year or two earlier such a change as this at the court of Burgundy would have meant disaster to Edward, happily the situation was now very different. In his heart Charles still preferred Henry VI to Edward IV, but Edward's support was so essential to the success of the league which he and Francis II were organizing against Louis that he felt no temptation to break the bond with the house of York which his father's kindness had created. If Margaret of Anjou's heart leapt with joyful anticipation when she heard that the Count of Charolais had become the actual ruler of Burgundy, it was only to find once more that her hopes were doomed to disappointment.

"Lord Jakes," as Englishmen dubbed Jacques de Luxembourg, paid two visits to England during the spring of 1465, and the sole object of the first one, which was evidently made in March, appears to have been to invite Edward to become a member of the league against Louis XI. Nor did Edward fail to show a lively interest in this proposal, for on 28th March he gave Warwick and Hastings a commission to treat with Lord Jakes for an alliance with the Count of Charolais.[1] In as much as Warwick conducted the negotiations, it is not surprising that no treaty was signed, but at least Edward presented Charles's envoy with one hundred and twenty-five pounds for his expenses, as well as jewels worth £108 13*s.* 2*d.*, and also, it is said, told him at parting that if the Count of Charolais found himself in need of assistance, he could rely on receiving it from England.[2] In addition, Edward showed willingness to renew friendly relations with the Duke of Brittany, from whom, and also from Jean de Rouville, he received letters while Jacques de Luxembourg was with him. He had felt little confidence in Francis since everything had turned out to be so different from what Rouville had led him to expect, but these letters sounded so friendly that they convinced him, as he wrote to the chancellor, of the duke's "good and toward disposition unto such amities as have been in communication between us heretofore," and a safeconduct, of eight months' duration, to give the duke plenty of time, was at once granted for an embassy from Brittany.[3] Probably Francis would not have been so readily trusted again, however, had it not been that every day brought fresh evidence of the Count of Charolais' kind intentions. Jacques de Luxembourg returned home in time to be one of the witnesses on the first day of May of a scene which gave striking proof, in its own way, that the friendliness between the courts of England and Burgundy had suffered no diminution through Charles's advent to power.

---

[1] Itinéraire de Philippe le Bon, 96; London Letter Book L, f. 37b—a letter from the king to the Mayor of London bidding him give his personal attendance at the queen's coronation at Westminster Palace on the Sunday before Pentecost.

[2] Du Clercq, liv. V, c. xviii; French Roll 4 Edw. IV, m. 7, 8th Oct. The October safeconduct gave Jacques de Luxembourg permission to bring with him one hundred persons of any degree and of any nationality except French.

[1] Rymer, XI, 540; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 439.

[2] Tellers' Roll, Mich. 4 Edw. IV; Treasurer's account in Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 1st March; Du Clercq, liv. V, c. xviii and xxiii; Commynes-Lenglet, II, 182. Charles afterwards accused Lannoy and the Croys of leze majesty and declared that they had allied themselves with the kings of France and England. Reiffenberg, Hist. de l'Ordre de la Toison d'Or, 45-46.

[3] Warrants under the Signet, file 1378, 15th April; Rymer, XI, 541. Among those named in the safeconduct were the chancellor and vice-chancellor of Brittany and Tanguy du Chastel. On 8th March Warwick and others had been named conservators of the truce with Brittany. Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 450. Their appointment seems to have been occasioned by the culmination of the trouble which had arisen from an attack made on a Breton ship four years before by a carvel belonging to Sir Hugh Courtenay. See Warrants under the Signet, file 1378, 5th June; Writs of Privy Seal, file 803, no. 1689; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 452, 488.

In April Edward and his household were at Shene, and one day when Lord Scales was speaking with his sister, the queen, and kneeling before her, with his bonnet doffed and lying on the floor beside him, the fair ladies of the court gathered about him, tied round his thigh a collar of gold and pearls with " a noble flower of souvenance enamelled and in manner of an emprise," and dropped into his bonnet a little roll of parchment tied with a thread of gold. Being wise in such matters, Scales at once understood that he was asked to win the flower of souvenance by some deed of chivalry, and after thanking the queen and the ladies for the honour they had done him, he carried the roll of parchment to the king, who broke the thread of gold and commanded the articles inscribed on the parchment to be read aloud. The exploit which the ladies had chosen for their willing champion and to which Edward, who, like all men of his day, was a lover of tournaments, gladly gave his approval, was a two days' encounter—the first day on horseback with spears and swords, the second on foot with spears, axes, and daggers—with some nobleman " of four lineages and without reproach," and the event was to take place in London in the following October.

As it happened, Anthony, Bastard of Burgundy, who enjoyed a great reputation for valour and who had now returned from his abortive crusade, had already written to Lord Scales that he would like to break a lance with him, and it was to the Bastard, consequently, that Scales immediately sent his challenge. Chester Herald carried the challenge across the sea, and he was told to say that, in case the Bastard was not able to come to England in October, his opponent would wait a year for him. Chester arrived at Brussels on the last day of April, and the next day the Bastard, in the presence of his father, of the Count of Charolais, and of many of the great lords of Burgundy, including Jacques de Luxembourg, touched the flower of souvenance in token of his acceptance of the challenge.

Nine days Chester remained at the court of Burgundy, and they were nine very pleasant days, as he was entertained " daily with a great cheer, as pertained an herald to have." On the tenth day he was given some letters for Lord Scales which promised that the Bastard would not fail to be in London on the day appointed for the tournament, unless he was prevented by the war (with Liége), which was now demanding his attention, or by " other so lawful letting"; and with the letters came a fine present for himself consisting of forty florins in money, the "rich gown furred with sables" which the Bastard had worn when he touched the emprise, and also the Bastard's "doublet of black velvet garnished with arming points, and the slits of the doublet sleeves clasped with clasps of gold." Arrayed in this finery, the herald paid his last visit to the ducal court, gave thanks, and took his leave; and on 23rd May, in the same gorgeous attire, he appeared before King Edward at Greenwich, gave an account of his journey and, by the king's command, fastened the emprise on Lord Scales's collar of gold.[1]

Chester returned to England just in time to do his part at the coronation of Elizabeth Woodville, which for some cause had been postponed until Whit Sunday. Preparations for the coronation had been going on for some time past, and it is evident that expense was not spared, as the treasurer of the household received four hundred pounds at the Exchequer to meet the extra outlay on the occasion. "Against the coronation of our most dear wife, the queen," the king also caused one Gerard van Rye to import for him divers jewels of gold and precious stones, and he bought "at our own price," which in this instance was fifty marks, "two bay coursers and a white courser" for the queen's chairs. One Elyn Langwith, a London silkwoman, provided certain stuffs worth £27 10*s.* for the queen's "chairs, saddle, and pillion," Matthew Philip supplied a cup and basin of gold the price of which was £108 5*s.* 6*d.*, John de Bardi of Florence two cloths of gold which cost two hundred and eighty pounds, and Sir John Howard, at a cost of twenty pounds, "the plate that the queen was served with the day of her coronation."[2]

On the same day on which Scales received back his emprise at Greenwich, the king rode up to London[3] and, in the queen's honour, created at the Tower nearly fifty knights of the Bath. This was a good many more knights than he had created at the time of his own coronation, and among those he saw fit to honour were not only such young noblemen as the Duke of Buckingham and his brother, Humphrey Stafford, both minors and in the king's custody, Viscount Lysle, also a minor, and John de Vere, who had so recently been acknowledged as Earl of Oxford, but the eldest son of Lord Grey de Ruthyn, a cousin of the queen's first husband, Lord Maltravers, the fiancé of the queen's sister Margaret, and two of the queen's brothers, Richard and John Woodville. The last-named was now the king's uncle by marriage as well as the queen's brother, as he had recently taken to wife the Dowager Duchess of Norfolk, a woman whose years were almost four times as many as his own and who had been already thrice widowed! But among the recipients of knighthood there were also a few more deserving persons, such as Lord Duras, Bartelot de Rivière, John Say, Speaker of the last parliament, five of the justices, the chief baron of the Exchequer, the mayor of London, Ralph Josselyn, and his predecessor in office, Matthew Philip, and three London aldermen, Thomas Cook, Hugh Wyche, and Henry Waver, who had earned the king's gratitude by making loans to him.[1] A few days later Lord Grey of Ruthyn was made Earl of Kent, a title which had been in abeyance since Fauconberg's death in January, 1463, and Sir Walter Blount, now treasurer of England, was raised to the rank of a baron of the realm with the title of Lord Mountjoy.[2]

---

[1] Excerpta Historica, 176-197. Cf. Olivier de la Marche, III, 41. In the Treasurer's account in Warrants for Issues 5 Edw. IV, 1st March, is recorded a payment of seven pounds to Chester Pursuivant sent by the king's order to the Duke of Burgundy.

[2] Tellers' Rolls, Easter and Mich. 5 Edw. IV; Customs Accounts, Sandwich, 128/8; Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 6th May, and 6 Edw. IV, 30th Sept.; Treasurer's account, *ut sup.;* Accounts and Memoranda of Sir John Howard, Manners and Household Expenses of England, 467.

[3] Privy Seals.

The queen came up to London, which had spent two hundred marks on decorations and prepared a gift of a thousand marks, on Friday, 24th May, and the Mayor and aldermen went to meet her on Shooter's Hill and escorted her to the Tower. On Saturday, seated in her horse-litter, she rode to Westminster Palace, all the new knights of the Bath accompanying her, and on Sunday she was crowned in the Abbey by the Archbishop of Canterbury.[3] A largess of twenty pounds for Garter and the other kings and heralds of arms was proclaimed, probably at the coronation banquet, and Walter Halyday, marshal of the king's "still minstrels," was granted the same sum to distribute among the minstrels, more than a hundred in all, who had come up to the city in attendance on certain lords of the realm.[1] On Monday there was a splendid tournament at Westminster and some of the noble knights of Burgundy who had been sent to the coronation with Jacques de Luxembourg, as Edward had requested, appeared in the lists. But the honours of the day were carried off by Lord Stanley, who received as a prize a ring set with a ruby.[2]

---

[1] Worcester, 783-784; Fabyan, 655; Hearne's Fragment, 295; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 80; Chron. of John Stone, 92; Stow, 419; Shaw, Knights of England.

[2] Writs of Privy Seal, file 803, nos. 1682, 1683; Charter Roll 5-7 Edw. IV, no. 194, m. 26; Close Roll 5 Edw. IV, m. 18; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 444.

[3] Worcester, Three Fif. Cent. Chron., and Chron. of John Stone, *ut sup.*; Nicolas's London Chron., 143; Sharpe, London and the Kingdom, I, 307; London Journal 7, ff. 97b and 99b.

A house in Smithfield called Ormond's Inn[3] was assigned to the newly crowned queen for her use, and she soon set up an elaborate ménage. At the head of her household was her chamberlain, Lord Berners, who was paid forty pounds a year and a reward of forty marks; but almost equally important, to judge from their salaries, were the master of the horse, John Woodville, who also got forty pounds a year, and the two carvers, Sir Humphrey Bourchier and James Haute, who got forty marks each. There were five ladies in waiting, Anne, Lady Bourchier, and Elizabeth, Lady Scales, who, like the chamberlain and the master of the horse, received forty pounds each, and Lady Alice Fogge, Lady Joanna Norreis, and Lady Elizabeth Ovedale, who received twenty pounds each; and in addition to these ladies, there were seven damsels and two other women attendants, whose salaries ranged from ten pounds down to five marks. The queen also had three minstrels who, for ten pounds divided among them, made sweet music for her pleasure; she had her confessor, Edward Story, chancellor of the University of Cambridge and later Bishop of Carlisle, to whom she paid ten pounds a year for shriving her, and her physician, Domenico de Sirego, who got four times that amount for physicking her, her chancellor, Roger Radcliff, her clerk of the signet, John Aleyn, her receiver general, John Forster, who is responsible for the account book from which all these facts about her household arrangements are gleaned, her attorney general and her solicitor, John Dyve and Robert Isham, and, finally, her own council chamber in the New Tower next the Exchequer. It is of some interest to know, too, that the young Duke of Buckingham and his brother, Humphrey Stafford, lived under the queen's roof, and that she hired one John Giles, master scholar, to teach them grammar. But it was a mere pittance that poor Master Giles got for his labours; for while the king allowed the queen five hundred marks a year for the expenses of the two boys,[1] six pounds was all that their tutor received for services extending over a year and three-quarters.[2]

---

[1] Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 16th and 20th June. In April, 1469, Edward granted a license to Walter Halyday, marshal, John Cliff, Robert Marshall, and five other minstrels to establish, continue, and augment a fraternity or gild erected in times past that they might pray for his soul, the soul of the queen, and the soul of the late Duke of York in St. Mary's Chapel in St. Paul's and in the free chapel of St. Antony. The fraternity was to elect a marshal for life and two wardens yearly, and it was to have supervision of the art of minstrels, except in the county of Chester, and to nominate the king's minstrels subject to the royal assent. Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 153. Cliff succeeded Halyday as marshal sometime before 1477, as on 3rd February of that year the reversion of the office of marshal of the king's "still minstrels," then held by Cliff, was granted to Alexander Mason. *Ibid.*, III, 22. Halyday, Cliff, and Marshall had been minstrels to Henry VI. Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 278.

[2] Worcester, *ut sup.*; Du Clercq, liv. V, c. xviii. As early as March the king had been buying horses, saddles, and other tournament requisites, and John Wode expended £33 10*s.* for "stuff" for the jousts to be held on the Monday after the queen's coronation. Wode's purchases included two hundred spears and a hundred and fifty cornalls or tilting lances. Writs of Privy Seal, file 802, no. 1630; Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 24th May. Cf. Wardrobe Accounts, 2-5 Edw. IV (Exchequer L.T.R.), roll 6, m. 55-56.

[3] The house stood in Knightriders Street (Giltspur Street). Stow, Survey, I, 247-248.

Elizabeth Woodville was now fully installed as queen of England, but during all the ceremonies connected with her coronation one person had been conspicuous by his absence. The Earl of Warwick, probably to the king's relief as well as his own, had other engagements. On 8th May Warwick, Wenlock, Hastings, the Dean of St. Severin's, Thomas Colt, and Richard Whetehill had been given a commission to treat with the Duke of Burgundy regarding the intercourse of merchandise and with the Count of Charolais, the Duke of Brittany, and even the king of France himself for a treaty of peace, friendship, intercourse of merchandise, or truce—in short, for anything obtainable. A few days later this imposing embassy had set out for Calais, and it was still beyond sea.[3]

Edward had expected that all the princes with whom his ambassadors were to negotiate would send their envoys to Calais, and that all the negotiations would take place there. But he would not have expected this had he realized that the Count of Charolais and the Duke of Brittany were about to make an open attack on Louis with the help of Louis' own brother, the Duke of Berry, whom they had succeeded in drawing into their league. By the time Warwick and his colleagues arrived at Calais, the army of the League of the Public Weal was already on the march, and it seemed very unlikely that anyone would come to negotiate with them. Nevertheless, in spite of the civil war which threatened to overwhelm him, and also in spite of a rumour that the Bastard of Brittany was bringing some English troops to the support of the Duke of Brittany,[1] Louis sent Georges Havart to Calais to treat for an extension of his truce with England for another year,[2] and some ambassadors from the Duke of Burgundy also came, if not all the way to Calais, at least to Boulogne. If the Duke of Brittany failed to send an embassy, he may have been sufficiently represented by those who spoke for the Count of Charolais.

---

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 463.

[2] Account Book of the Receiver General of Queen Elizabeth, 6-7 Edw. IV, Miscellaneous Books, Exchequer T. of R., no. 207. Several times in this account book precedents are cited from the household arrangements of Margaret of Anjou.

[3] Rymer, XI, 541-543. The Dean of St. Severin's, Kent, and Colt seem to have started for Calais on 9th May, but Hastings, and probably Warwick and Wenlock also, not until the 11th. Whetehill was probably already at Guines. Hastings was allowed 40*s.* a day for seventy-three days, that is, from 11th May, the day he left London, to 22nd July, the day he returned to London, while the Dean of St. Severin's, Kent, and apparently Colt also, received 20*s.* a day from 9th May to 22nd July. Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 3rd May and 5th Sept.; Tellers' Rolls, Easter and Mich. 5 Edw. IV. Warwick probably received 66*s.* 8*d.* a day as he did before. A payment of £40 to him for his expenses is recorded in the treasurer's account in Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 1st March, and in Tellers' Roll, Easter 5 Edw. IV.

The negotiations at Calais and Boulogne dragged on for some weeks, but Warwick probably put little heart into them, and they accomplished next to nothing. Although Margaret of Anjou's old friend Brezé was with Louis' army, her brother, John of Calabria, and also Edmund Beaufort, who now claimed the title of Duke of Somerset, were with the army of the League of the Public Weal, and owing, perhaps, to that fact, or perhaps to the half-heartedness of Warwick's urging, the Count of Charolais shrank back when it came to a question of entering into an open alliance with Edward.[3] The negotiations with the Burgundian ambassadors resulted in nothing except an agreement that another meeting of ambassadors, to treat for a further extension of the intercourse of merchandise between England and Burgundy and perhaps other things as well, should take place at St. Omer on the first day of October.[1] And the negotiations with Louis, and also those with Francis II, if there were any, seem to have resulted in nothing whatever. The truce between England and France was not prolonged, and neither was the truce between England and Brittany.[2] The strange battle of Montlhéri, among whose victims was Pierre de Brezé, occurred on 16th July, and six days later Edward's ambassadors reached London again.[3]

---

[1] Dupuy, Réunion de la Bretagne à la France, I, 107.

[2] At first Louis thought of asking for an extension of the truce for twenty years, but he changed his mind. Compare the commission given to Havart on 16th May with a letter Louis sent to him on 29th May. Commynes-Lenglet, II, 458; Lettres de Louis XI, II, 309. As early as 12th January Edward had granted a safeconduct for Havart and Charles de Melun, Louis' chamberlain, who were coming to treat regarding the matters which had already been discussed at St. Omer. Signed Bills, file 1496, no. 4067.

[3] Worcester, 784; Hearne's Fragment, 295; Mémoires de Messire Jean, Seigneur de Haynin et de Louvegnies, I, 11. According to Worcester, the negotiations with Burgundy took place at Boulogne, while those with Louis were carried on at Calais. On this point he is probably right, though in some respects he has confused the negotiations of this and the following year.

It must have been a sore cross to the king of France that the League of the Public Weal had prevented him from going to meet Warwick when the earl at last came to treat with him. But he hoped for another chance, and in the meantime the correspondence between him and Warwick continued. Nine days after he returned from Calais, Warwick wrote to Louis from London to say that certain English merchants, some of whom were his friends, had complained to him that a small vessel which they had sent to Normandy with a cargo of cloth, pewter, and lead had been seized by some Spaniards while it was unloading in one of Louis' harbours.[4] The earl asked for letters of marque or other means of forcing restitution, and it is safe to conclude that he got what he wanted, although Louis' reply to his letter has not been preserved.

The first duty Warwick had to perform after he got back to London was nothing less than to conduct Henry VI to the Tower.

In the spring there had been plans for another meeting of English and Scottish commissioners at Alnwick on 10th July, and by Edward at least it was hoped that the outcome would be a perpetual peace between England and Scotland and the marriage of James III with some lady of England.[5] But in the meantime a suspicion that Henry VI was being sheltered in James's kingdom had entered Edward's mind, and in May preparations were made to send a fleet to the north "for the defence of the realm in the parts of Scotland."[1] Spies were also put to work to find out what was being said and done beyond the border,[2] and probably Henry became frightened and begged the Bishop of St. Andrews, as he had done once before, to help him join his friends in England. At any rate, sooner or later Henry crept back to England, and for some time he wandered from place to place in the northern counties, where even now the house of Lancaster had many sympathizers. More than once he was a guest under the roof of John Maychell of Crackenthorpe, near Appleby;[3] there is reason to believe that at one time he took refuge in a monastery (probably Furness) and wore a monk's cowl; and there are traces of his weary footsteps at several other places in Lancashire.[4]

---

[1] See a letter which the London mercers sent to Caxton in October. Blades, Life and Typography of William Caxton (condensed edition), 149-150.

[2] See in Writs of Privy Seal, file 805, first, a safeconduct granted on 19th September to John Defoulgieres, merchant of Dieppe, which was to endure from 1st October, the day the truce between England and France would expire, till 31st December, and which was given to him because " the said truce is nearhand expired " and he had not yet sold some wine he had shipped to England ; second, a year's safeconduct granted on 25th August to William Roderigo, merchant of Brittany, because he was unable to collect certain sums owing to him in England before the expiration of the truce with Brittany, " which shall be the first day of October next coming."

[3] See note above.

[4] MS. français 4054, f. 183.

[5] Rymer, XI, 546.

But it was in Yorkshire, at Waddington Hall, near Bashall, that Henry was finally discovered by his enemies. Waddington Hall was a seat of the Tempests of Bracewell, and Sir Richard Tempest had received him and made him welcome; but one day, as he sat at dinner, Sir Richard's brother, John Tempest, burst into the room, followed by Sir Thomas Talbot of Bashall, John Talbot of Salesbury, Sir James Harington, and a few other men, and attempted to seize him. Sir Richard himself, who, it is to be feared, was a party to his brother's plan, made no effort to defend his guest, but some of the other men who were present tried so gallantly to protect the king that he was able to escape from the house to a wood, where his wanderings might have been continued for some time longer had not a heartless monk of Abingdon put his pursuers on his track. The poor king was captured near Bungerly Hippingstones, a ford across the Ribble in Lancashire, on 13th July, and with him were taken Thomas Mannyng, once Dean of Windsor, John Bedon, a doctor of divinity, and a groom whose name seems to have been Ellerton.[5]

---

[1] London granted 500 marks for the victualling of the ships. London Journal 7, f. 99b.

[2] Edward sent one William Alayn to Scotland to learn the intentions of his enemies and report to his council. Tellers' Roll, Mich. 5 Edw. IV; Cal. Documents relating to Scotland, IV, 276.

[3] Rymer, XI, 575; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 536. Cf. Writs of Privy Seal, file 808, no. 1923.

[4] Basin, II, 53; Warkworth, 43.

[5] Warkworth, 5, 40-43; Waurin, II, 285-286; Chron. of John Stone, 93; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 80; Worcester, 785; Gregory, 232-233; Stow, 419. Too little attention has been paid to Waurin's account of Henry's capture, which does much to elucidate Warkworth's. According to Worcester, Sir

At the moment of Henry's capture, Edward and his queen were on their way to Canterbury on a pilgrimage. But the delivery of news so important and so welcome was not to be delayed, and three or four days later a Lancashire monk came hurrying to Canterbury with letters that told the story. The king and queen and Archbishop Bourchier went forthwith to the cathedral to announce the news to the people, a *Te Deum* was sung, a sermon was preached, and there was a procession to Becket's tomb. A week later, on 24th July, the prisoners were brought to London, and Warwick, who had just arrived from Calais, went out to Islington to meet them. It was the third time that Henry had come to London as a captive, and this time there were no trappings of royalty. Warwick formally arrested him in Edward's name, and then, with his feet bound to the stirrups of his saddle with leather thongs, the man who had ruled over England for thirty-nine years and had wilfully sinned against no one was led "through Cheapside and so through all London to the Tower." On the following day King Edward returned to the city and took up his abode in Westminster Palace.[1]

One of the men who had been taken with Henry, Thomas Mannyng, was soon released from the Tower. He was "aged and infected with a white leper," and on 7th November Edward granted him a general pardon. John Bedon's friends, after labouring hard and spending much money, secured his release also, but as he "could not keep his tongue," he soon found himself behind prison bars again. His second imprisonment lasted several months, but he was finally liberated once more, and on 18th June, 1467, he, too, was given a general pardon.[2] For King Henry himself, however, there was no hope of release. Friends could do nothing for him—dared not even plead for him—and years were to pass before he emerged from the Tower. Yet he was not badly treated. "Every man was suffered to come and speak with him by license of the keepers," one chronicler states, and according to another Edward gave orders that he was to be supplied with all necessaries and treated with respect and as much kindness as was consistent with his safe

---

Richard Tunstall was one of the king's captors. But this is certainly incorrect, as the next time we hear of Tunstall he is fighting for Henry in Wales. It is more likely that he was one of the king's defenders, as Waurin says.

[1] Chron. of John Stone, 93-94; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., Worcester, and Warkworth, *ut sup.;* Privy Seals. Cf. Du Clercq, liv. V, c. xlix.

[2] Gregory, 233; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 470; II, 11. Mannyng died in great poverty some time before the end of 1469. Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 180.

custody.[1] From the time "Henry of Windsor, late *de facto* and *non de jure* king of England," entered the Tower, five marks a week were allowed for his expenses and those of his attendants, and a chaplain, William Kymberley by name, for a salary of sevenpence halfpenny a day, which Edward paid, "ministered daily God's service" before him.[2] Sometimes, too, wine was sent to him from Edward's own cellars, and although it is stated that, when he was removed from the Tower five years later, he was "not worshipfully arrayed as a prince, and not so cleanly kept as should seem such a prince," on one occasion at least several yards of velvet and cloth of "violet ingrain" were purchased to be made into gowns and doublets for him.[3] Nevertheless, it was captivity, however lenient, and captivity for which Henry, gentle, clouded in mind, could see no justification. It is said that to visitors who were heartless enough to question him about what they called his usurpation of the throne he would reply that his father had been king of England, and his grandfather before him, and that he himself, "when a boy in the cradle, had been without any interval crowned in peace and approved as king by the whole realm, and wore the crown for well-nigh forty years, every lord doing royal homage to me and swearing fealty as they had done to my forefathers; so I may say with the Psalmist, 'The lines are fallen unto me in a pleasant place, yea, I have a goodly heritage'; 'My help cometh of God, who preserveth them that are true of heart.'"[4]

Those who had helped to capture Henry did not go unrewarded. Sir Thomas Talbot, Sir James Harington, and Sir John Tempest were given not only a hundred marks for their expenses while riding about in search of the king, but, in addition, rewards of a hundred pounds or a hundred marks each. One John Levesay, who had been useful in some way, got twenty pounds and an annuity, and ten marks were divided between William Roggers, a monk of Cerne, and David Cholmlay, a groom of the king's chamber who had been sent into Cheshire shortly before Henry was taken, probably in search of information concerning his whereabouts.[1] Sir James Harington, who had recently received a grant of land from the king, was given a new patent stating that the grant was made in consideration of his diligence at the time of the capture of Henry VI, and annuities were bestowed on John Talbot and other members of the Talbot family, on poor Henry's unfeeling host, Sir Richard Tempest, on Nicholas Tempest, and on several other men.[2] But there is no trace of any reward for the monk of Abingdon who is said to have betrayed the king's hiding place in the wood, or for William Cantelowe, a prominent London mercer who had been made a knight of the Bath at the time of Edward's coronation and who, according to two of the chroniclers, was the person who actually captured the king.[3] The distribution of rewards was sufficiently liberal, however, to stimulate more hunts for "rebels." Before the year was done, other rewards were paid for the capture of Henry Coventry, a man whose arrest had been ordered immediately after the battle of Wakefield and who had been attainted in 1461, and for "the taking and bringing unto our presence of Sir John Shelis, priest, William Peverell, and Briggeforth, our rebels."[4]

---

[1] Warkworth, 5; Hist. Croy. Cont., 539.

[2] Warrants for Issues, 6 Edw. IV, 15th March and 4th Nov.; Warrants for Issues, 7 Edw. IV, 20th Jan.; Issue Roll, Easter 8 Edw. IV, 13th May; Devon, Issues of the Exchequer, 490. For some reason Henry VI is sometimes described in the records as Henry Beaufort, although he was in no way descended from Katharine Swynford. See, for example, Issue Roll, Easter 8 Edw. IV, 25th June, and entries in a roll of Treasurer's accounts of 6 Edw. IV of payments to William Kymberley, chaplain, and others for Henry's expenses in the Tower.

[3] Household account of 5-6 Edw. IV, Accounts, etc. (Exchequer K. R.), bundle 411, no. 15; Issue Roll, Easter 8 Edw. IV, 25th June; Warkworth, 11.

[4] Stubbs, Cons. Hist. of England, III, 207, translating from Blakman, De Virtutibus et miraculis Henrici VI.

When or how the news of her husband's capture came to Margaret of Anjou no one tells us. But what it meant to her can easily be guessed. She was still at St. Mighel, and there she continued to reside; but some of her friends, either because she could provide for them no longer or because they were weary of poverty and inactivity, had already wandered away from her little court, and others soon followed them. Edmund Beaufort had already gone to fight for the Count of Charolais in the war of the League of the Public Weal, and sooner or later the Duke of Exeter and others, all in great poverty, likewise drifted to the court of Burgundy.

---

[1] Treasurer's account in Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 1st March; Tellers' Roll, Easter 5 Edw. IV; Devon, Issues of the Exchequer, 489.

[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 445, 455, 460; Rymer, XI, 548; Rolls of Parl., V, 584; Warkworth, 42.

[3] Hearne's Fragment, 292; Fabyan, 654; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., viii; Shaw, Knights of England.

[4] Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 20th Sept. and 2nd Dec. (the second of these warrants has been placed by mistake among the Warrants for Issues of 10 Edw. IV); Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 655; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 268.

Philip de Commynes relates how he saw Exeter following barefooted in the train of the Duke of Burgundy and begging his bread from door to door, until someone recognized him and the duke gave him a small pension.[1]

Philip of Burgundy could be merciful to the poverty-stricken friends of Henry and Margaret, and the Count of Charolais could offer the brother of his late friend, Somerset, a chance to fight in his army, but neither Philip nor Charles had any thought of giving offence to Edward. Nor does Edward seem to have taken offence when he heard that Burgundy had become the asylum of some of his bitterest enemies. As soon as an enemy became powerless to do him harm, Edward gave him no further thought.

With the battle of Montlhéri the war of the League of the Public Weal practically ended, and to all appearance the enemies of the king of France had triumphed. But the final events of that war, added to the revolt of the city of Liége, made it impossible for the Bastard of Burgundy to come to England in October to keep his appointment with Lord Scales, who had to find such consolation as he could in the reports of the Bastard's achievements on genuine battlefields.[2] It was probably the same events which also prevented the meeting of English and Burgundian ambassadors that was to have taken place on the first day of October. Some English ambassadors were in Brussels at the end of September and were feasted by Philip on the 29th,[3] but there was no diet at St. Omer. Yet it was out of the question to let the intercourse of merchandise between England and Burgundy lapse. In matters commercial, relations between the two countries had been somewhat strained since Philip's edict against English cloth, but no one doubted that the intercourse must continue; and when it became evident that the " convention of the lords " was not going to take place, Edward called upon the mercers to make the necessary arrangements with Philip. The mercers, however, shrank from the undertaking. This was a matter of such weight, they said, that in the past the king and his council had always dealt with it, and they entreated the mayor, to whom Edward had addressed his letter, to write to the king "in the most pleasant wise" he could and ask him to perform the task himself. But the mercers also dispatched a copy of the king's letter and a report of what they had done to William Caxton at Bruges on 17th October with the anxious injunction that, as the day of the expiration of the intercourse "cometh nigh upon, and how that the king's writing and his message shall be sped from hence we are not certain," he and the "fellowship" there should take steps at once to insure the safety of their persons and goods. At the same time they hoped that shortly there would "come writing from the king to the duke, or else from the duke to the king, if it will so happen, for prorogation" of the intercourse;[1] and as it turned out, Edward sent Rougecroix Pursuivant to Philip, and Philip sent messengers to Edward,[2] and by some means the intercourse was extended.

---

[1] Commynes, I, 195. Exeter was in Utrecht during 1466 and 1467. Stein, Die Merchant Adventurers in Utrecht, Hansische Geschichtsblätter, 1899, pp. 186, 188, note 1.

[2] See a letter which Scales wrote to the Bastard on 13th November. Excerpta Historica, 196.

[3] Itinéraire de Philippe le Bon, 98.

Although the intercourse of merchandise between England and Burgundy suffered no interruption in consequence of the abandonment of the St. Omer diet, the truce between England and France expired on the first day of October, and immediately the "grand guerre" on the sea was resumed—this time, apparently, with worse results for the English than for the French.[3] Robert Neville was sent to France again, but "for divers secret matters," not to renew the truce,[4] and all hope of such an understanding between England and France as Warwick desired seemed to have vanished. Not only was Louis aware of the effort the Count of Charolais and the Duke of Brittany had made to draw England into their league, but he feared Edward's influence over his southern neighbours again. For Henry the Impotent now loved Louis as little as did Charles and Francis and was almost as eager as they to secure England for an ally.[5]

Bernard de la Forsse had spent the whole winter and spring in Castile, and when at last he came home, he seems to have brought with him an embassy from Henry the Impotent. What the Spanish ambassadors had been charged to offer the king of England there

[1] See some extracts from the mercers' records printed in the condensed edition of Blades, Life and Typography of William Caxton, 149-150. It is possible that the mercers' records would throw further light on the relations between England and Burgundy, but when I asked to be allowed to consult them, my request was refused.

[2] Treasurer's account, Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 1st March; Tellers' Roll, Mich. 5 Edw. IV.

[3] Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 181.

[4] Treasurer's account, Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 1st March.

[5] Chastellain, V, 339.

is no means of knowing, but Edward received them graciously, paid their expenses while they were in England, and presented one of them with an image of St. George and another with two saltcellars.[1] A little later Bernard de la Forsse went back to Spain, accompanied by the queen's chaplain and secretary, John Gunthorp, and before leaving England, he bought a little carvel for which he was granted a year's safeconduct to bring home Gascon wine and other merchandise and into which, as the king wrote to the chancellor, he "put certain shipmen of Spain and some Gascons, because that it may surely go all about in all parties in saying that she is of Spain, which ship shall also be the readier to do us service at all times."[2]

In Catalonia, too, Louis had reason to fear Edward's interference. As soon as the eyes of the Catalonians had been opened to Louis' designs, they had become as determined to resist his pretensions as those of John of Aragon, and in the autumn of 1463 they had invited Dom Pedro of Portugal to rule over them. Dom Pedro was able to scrape up some hereditary claims to the crown of Aragon, but he was no more fit to conduct a revolution than his predecessor, Don Carlos of Viana, had been, and after his arrival in Catalonia one disaster followed another. At last, however, it occurred to Dom Pedro that an alliance with England might save the situation, and at some time during the summer of 1465 one Berenger Marti—or Martyn, as he is called in the English records—arrived in England from Barcelona, evidently to ask Edward to give the hand of his sister Margaret to Dom Pedro.[3] This proposal was not without attractions for Edward, as he had not yet provided for his sister, and he sent an envoy to Dom Pedro who reached Barcelona on 8th January, 1466, and who must have given Dom Pedro every reason to hope, as in the following March Dom Pedro was choosing a betrothal ring. But the next June Dom Pedro died, and thus Margaret of York was saved for a happier fate than that of the wife of a man whose throne was tottering under him.[4]

The negotiations with Dom Pedro did not prevent—perhaps they caused—an exchange of embassies between Edward and John of Aragon. For when Louis XI learned that a Catalonian envoy was passing through France on his way to England, he caused the man to be arrested and offered to hand him over to John,[1] who in this way, if in no other, got wind of what Dom Pedro was trying to do. But Edward sent one John de Puys to Aragon, and later John of Aragon sent some knight to England;[2] and if John's fears were not quieted by the messages exchanged, they were by the death of Dom Pedro. For after Dom Pedro's death the Catalonians called René of Anjou to their throne, and with that all danger of an alliance between them and Edward came to an end.

---

[1] Treasurer's account, *ut sup.*; Tellers' Rolls, Easter and Mich. 5 Edw. IV. Roderigo Guzman seems to have been the chief of the Spanish embassy.

[2] Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 28th July, and 7 Edw. IV, 13th July; Writs of Privy Seal, file 808, no. 1939, 17th June, 1466.

[3] One John Alverays was paid £20 for the expenses of Berenger Martyn, knight, sent from Barcelona to the king of England in Easter term, 5 Edw. IV. Treasurer's account, *ut sup.* On Berenger Marti, see Calmette, 324, note.

[4] Calmette, 260-261.

If the interests of the kings of England and France still clashed in the Spanish peninsula, so did they also in Scotland, which, like Castile, had lost all faith in Louis' honesty and was drifting steadily towards an alliance with Edward. The Count of Charolais had even tried to make James III as well as Edward a party to the league against Louis, and James's ministers, still smarting from the strange reports about the French king brought home by the ambassadors who had been at York, had gone so far as to send an embassy to Brussels in July.[3] That the matter ended there may have been because the Bishop of St. Andrews willed it so. But the bishop's life was nearly over now, as he died at some time during this year.[4] And even while he lived, Louis could not hope for any active help from him. For throughout his last days Kennedy continued to accept his pension from Edward, and at one time he also received, by the hands of Gerard Caniziani, a gift of two hundred pounds "for divers secret matters," for which, it may be added, Edward's other pensioner, the Bishop of Aberdeen, got four hundred pounds.[5]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, 261, note 2.

[2] Treasurer's Account, *ut sup.*; Tellers' Roll, Easter 5 Edw. IV.

[3] Commynes-Lenglet, II, 460-463; Itinéraire de Philippe le Bon, 98.

[4] Lesley says the bishop died on 10th May, 1466, but the editor of the Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland (I, xl) decided that he died early in 1465. On the other hand, there is some reason for fixing the date of his death between 2nd and 18th July, 1465. See Herkless and Hannay, The Archbishops of St. Andrews, I, 70-71. He must have been alive until after Easter (14th April), 1465, as he drew his pension from Edward for the year ending at that time. Tellers' Roll, Mich. 5 Edw. IV.

[5] Treasurer's account, *ut sup.* For other payments made to the Bishop of Aberdeen, see another Treasurer's account in Warrants for Issues, 7 Edw. IV, 12th Dec., and a list of "parcelles" delivered for the king to John Shukburgh against Christmas, 8 Edw. IV, which is to be found in Warrants for Issues, 9 Edw. IV.

When the king of England had two of James III's chief councillors on his pension list, and perhaps more—for by 1468, if not earlier, Lord Boyd, a member of the family which controlled James after Kennedy's death, and Duncan of Dundas were also Edward's pensioners[1]—the king of France certainly needed to act with care if he wanted to preserve the ancient alliance between France and Scotland. But in spite of the advice he had received from Monypenny a year since, Louis seems to have done nothing to soothe the ruffled feelings of the Scots, and early in November a Scottish embassy arrived at his court with the demand for the surrender of the county of Saintonge which he had been told they might make. Louis replied, as his father had done in his time, that Saintonge had been promised to James's grandfather on condition that he furnished the king of France with six thousand men and came to France himself if needed, and that, as Charles VII recovered his kingdom without other help than that of God and his own faithful subjects, there was no reason for the surrender of Saintonge to the king of Scotland. The Scots answered that it was not the fault of the king of Scotland that the six thousand men had not been sent, that he had always been ready and willing to keep his promise to send them, and that he ought, therefore, to have had his reward. Someone, perhaps Monypenny himself, to whom Louis then referred the Scots for their answer, advised Louis to send an embassy to Scotland with an offer of a marriage alliance and also suggested that, if he would take James's brother, the Duke of Albany, into his household and win his love and service, no one in Scotland would dare to offend him for fear of losing his head and all the " trafiques et petites alliances " of that kingdom with England and other countries would be checked.[2] But again Louis neglected the wise advice offered to him, and the result was what he might have looked for. On 4th December an imposing English embassy headed by the three Neville brothers, the Archbishop of York, Warwick, and Northumberland, met at Newcastle a Scottish embassy headed by the Bishops of Glasgow and Aberdeen and the Earl of Argyle, and eight days later it was agreed that the truce between England and Scotland should continue until the last day of October in the year 1519.[1] Evidently a treaty of alliance was not far away.

---

[1] See Issue Roll, Easter 8 Edw. IV, 25th June, for a payment to Boyd and Duncan of Dundas by the hands of Albany Herald of £200 " de quadam annua pencione eis per dominum regem assignata." There is also record of a reward of £10 6*s*. 8*d*. paid to Boyd. Issue Roll, Mich. 7 Edw. IV, 21st Oct.

[2] Reponses données à messieurs les ambassadeurs d'Ecosse à Paris le 13 novembre, 1465. Legrand collections, MS. français 6972, ff. 234-239.

So the old struggle between England and France went on, not on French battlefields now, but in the courts of Europe, and first one party seemed to win and then the other. Yet Edward's thoughts were not absorbed entirely by France and France's neighbours. He was also negotiating in these days with the king of Denmark and with the Hanseatic League.

As Denmark resented the commercial monopoly which the Hanseatic League enjoyed in the north of Europe and had been struggling for some years past to obtain a more independent position for herself in the world of trade, Christian I of Denmark made up his mind, when he heard that the attempt of the Hanse towns to arrange a diet with England had not succeeded, to seek a treaty with England himself, and as far back as November, 1464, he had asked Edward for a safeconduct for the Bishop of Viborg and other ambassadors.[2] But the safeconduct, though granted, was never used, and probably the reason was that, before the Bishop of Viborg was ready to start for England, the Hanse towns had induced Edward to consent again to the holding of a diet at Hamburg.

Edward had cherished no resentment against the Hanse towns on account of the miscarriage of the diet which was to have met in June, 1464. In January, 1465, he had even written to Hamburg expressing his willingness to grant a two years' safeconduct to the merchants of such Hanseatic towns as would grant a like safeconduct to English merchants, and offering to send another embassy to meet representatives of the League at Utrecht or at some other place nearer England.[3] When some of the Hanse towns raised objections to Utrecht, he again consented to send his ambassadors to Hamburg, and while the king of Poland, some of whose noble subjects had recently visited England,[4] and the more friendly Hanse towns promptly sent the two years' safeconduct he had demanded, with Lubeck he finally agreed to exchange safeconducts good only until St. Martin's Day.[1] The 25th of July was the date set for the diet, and on 11th June Edward gave commissions to Goldwell, Dean of Salisbury, and three of the men who had started for Hamburg the year before, Doctor Henry Sharp and the Bishop's Lynn merchants, Bermycham and Cony, to treat with the kings of Denmark and Poland, the Master of Prussia, and the Hanse towns for a perpetual peace or, failing that, for a truce and intercourse of merchandise.[2] Yet this time it was the English who were late. On 13th July Edward's ambassadors had not yet left England, and although he wrote to apologize for their delay and to say that they would come very soon, they did not reach Hamburg until 2nd September.[3]

---

[1] Rymer, XI, 549, 556-559; Cal. Documents relating to Scotland, IV, 276. Ratifications of the new treaty were to be exchanged on 1st July, and Edward's was drawn up on 1st June. Signed Bills, file 1498, no. 4170; Rotuli Scotiæ, II, 419-420.

[2] Warrants under the Signet, file 1378, 21st Nov.; Rymer, XI, 537. Edward wrote to the chancellor that, as Christian's request for the safeconduct "came only of him," he hoped that "right good and fruitful matter shall grow by the same," and in a postscript he gave orders that no fee was to be taken for the safeconduct.

[3] Hanserecesse, II, 5, pp. 459-460.

[4] Tellers' Roll, Mich. 4 Edw. IV; Treasurer's account, Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 1st March. Cf. Arnold's Chronicle (London, 1811), xxxv.

When the diet opened at last, on 19th September, the first difficulty encountered was one of language, as the Englishmen could not speak the language of the Hanse men and the Hanse men could not speak the language of the Englishmen; and in the end it was necessary to appoint a committee of learned gentlemen who could exchange their thoughts in Latin. The next difficulty was even more serious. The Englishmen were empowered to sign a treaty of peace, but they were not empowered to discuss compensation for injuries, although such compensation was the very thing upon which both Lubeck and Bremen had insisted from the first. Cologne, Hamburg, and Dantzic were in favour of signing a treaty in spite of this, but Lubeck and Bremen objected and proposed what amounted to a prorogation of the diet, whereupon the English ambassadors replied that King Edward could not be expected to make reparation for injuries committed when usurpers occupied the throne of England, and also that he had given them no authority to prorogue the diet. All attempts to effect a compromise failed, and early in October the diet broke up without having accomplished anything. After the representatives of the other towns had departed, those of Cologne, Hamburg, and Dantzic tried to continue the negotiations, but all in vain.[4]

The English ambassadors did not have to go home quite empty-handed, as Christian of Denmark had sent to Hamburg the embassy he had not sent to England, and on 3rd October a treaty of alliance between England and Denmark had been signed.[1] But as far as the Hanseatic League was concerned, the diet had failed, and Edward never forgave Lubeck and her satellites. At the request of Hamburg, of whose friendly attitude during the diet he expressed warm appreciation, he consented, on 4th March, 1466, to confirm the privileges of the Hansards in England for five years more; but he announced that the grant would cease at the end of two years unless all the Hanse towns united in sending an embassy to him to conclude a commercial treaty or a perpetual peace and league. And he also gave warning that he would concede no unjust claims.[2]

---

[1] Hanserecesse, II, 5, pp. 461-463.
[2] Rymer, XI, 543-545.
[3] Hanserecesse, II, 5, pp. 469, 471.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 481-506.

---

[1] Edward ratified this treaty on 1st March, 1466, and again, for some reason, in the following November. Rymer, XI, 551, 560; 45th Report of the Deputy Keeper, 5; Warrants under the Signet, file 1379, 28th Nov., 1466. It should be noticed that the ratification printed by Rymer, XI, 551, is taken from French Roll 6 Edw. IV and belongs to 1466, not to 1465 as one might suppose. Sharp received 20*s*. a day while at Hamburg, Bermycham and Cony as much between them. Goldwell's wages were £168 for a half year. Tellers' Roll, Easter 5 Edw. IV.

[2] Hanserecesse, II, 5, pp. 556-557; French Roll 6 Edw. IV, m. 21.

CHAPTER III

BURGUNDY OR FRANCE?

EDWARD'S first child was born on 11th February, 1466. There is a story that one Master Dominic foretold that the child would be a boy and, hoping to be the first to tell the king of the birth of his son, gained admission to an outer chamber, when the queen's hour of travail came, and as soon as he heard the child cry, called at the queen's chamber door to ask "what the queen had." But the answer that came back to him in the voice of one of the queen's ladies was, "Whatsoever the queen's grace hath here within, sure it is that a fool standeth there without." Whereupon Master Dominic departed in confusion "without seeing of the king for that time."

Even if the sex of the king's first offspring was disappointing, there was nothing lacking in the reception given to the little princess. Almost a month before the queen's confinement the Archbishop of Canterbury and nine other bishops had been summoned to assist at the baptism of the child "which the queen shall bring forth,"[1] but when the time came, it was George Neville, Archbishop of York, who did the baptizing, and the Earl of Warwick and the two grandmothers, the Duchess of York and the Dowager Duchess of Bedford, who stood as sponsors for the child at the font. The baby was given her mother's name, Elizabeth.[2]

The churching of the queen was made an occasion for as much pomp and ceremony as the baptism, and luckily for our curiosity it was witnessed by one Gabriel Tetzel of Nuremberg, who had just arrived in England with Leo, Lord of Rozmital, brother of the queen of Bohemia, and who has left a very entertaining account of all that he saw and did in the island kingdom.

George of Podiebrad, the Hussite king of Bohemia, had to contend with civil discord at home as well as with the hostility of the Pope abroad, and as he was badly in need of more support than he was receiving from the weak and parsimonious Emperor, Frederick III, probably the real purpose of the Lord of Rozmital's wanderings through Europe was to raise up friends for his brother-in-law. It was as pilgrims, however, that Rozmital and his companions set out, and they visited every holy shrine that lay in their path and listened with implicit faith to every miracle tale that was told them. Finally they arrived in Burgundy, and when the king of England heard that they were there and that they desired to visit his kingdom, he made haste to send them a safeconduct,[1] as travellers from Bohemia were not seen in western Europe every day and visitors from a strange land were hailed with pleasure at any court. So it happened that about three weeks after the birth of the Princess Elizabeth the noble Bohemian pilgrims crossed from Calais to Sandwich, suffering desperately from seasickness on the way, rode to Canterbury, where they gazed with astonishment at the tomb of Thomas à Becket with its priceless gems, and at last arrived in London. In London, too, there were many holy shrines to be visited, and they were not neglected, but one of the pilgrims at least was not thinking only of saints and martyrs as he entered England's capital. Tetzel's eye was quick to notice the signs of prosperity in London, the merchants of all lands to be met in the streets, and also the many native craftsmen, especially goldsmiths and clothworkers. Nor did he fail to observe that the women were very beautiful, nor to learn before he departed that they were not to be easily bought.

---

[1] Exchequer T. R., Council and Privy Seal, file 89, m. 49 (19th Jan.).

[2] Fabyan, 655; Hearne's Fragment, 295; Kingsford's London Chron., 179; Worcester, 785; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 181; Hist. Croy. Cont., 551; Harleian MS. 543, f. 130; Additional MS. 6113, f. 84b.

The king of England had prepared handsome lodgings for his expected guests, and as soon as the pilgrims arrived, a herald and one of the royal councillors came to welcome them and to invite them to Westminster Palace. When they arrived at the palace, the king greeted them with much cordiality, shook hands with them, and plied the Lord of Rozmital with questions; and every man of them was immediately captivated, as people generally were, by Edward's good looks and affable manners. The royal welcome included a banquet, and if the king of England's banquets were not as famous as the Duke of Burgundy's, this one at least was not to be sneered at; for fifty courses were served, and when the stranger guests rose from the table, Edward with his own hand hung upon their necks beautiful collars or badges, golden ones for the knights and silver ones for all the others. The king even offered knighthood itself, but though he urged and the Lord of Rozmital urged, few of the sturdy Bohemians could be induced to accept an honour which probably seemed to them to have little value or meaning when given in a banquet hall.

---

[1] Rymer, XI, 560. Philip had feasted the Bohemians at Brussels on 20th January. Itinéraire de Philippe le Bon, 99.

That the king of England was a great king his visitors could see, and they were much impressed by the reverence his courtiers paid him. But more impressive still, it seemed to them, was the reverence exacted by the queen of England. The fame of Elizabeth Woodville's beauty—a beauty so great that it had captured not only a royal heart but a royal hand—had probably reached even to the ends of Europe, and Tetzel's pen lingers gossipingly over the details of the churching of the lovely *parvenue*, which he had the good fortune to see.

First in the procession to the Abbey, Tetzel records, came ecclesiastics with sacred relics, then scholars bearing lighted candles and singing as they walked, then noble matrons and maidens from all parts of the kingdom, then trumpeters, pipers, and players of stringed instruments, then two and forty of the king's minstrels, then four and twenty heralds and pursuivants, then three score lords and knights, and finally, under a canopy, the queen herself, supported by two dukes and followed by her mother and other ladies to the number of three score. The service in the Abbey Tetzel does not describe, but when it was over, he says, the same stately procession accompanied the queen back to the palace, and there all remained to dine. So numerous were the guests that they filled four large halls, and so honoured was the Lord of Rozmital that he alone of all the guests was invited to sit at the table of "the king's greatest earl"—Warwick, no doubt—who, as etiquette did not permit the king himself to be present, occupied the royal seat and, as the king's representative, received all the honours of royalty. During the dinner a largess was distributed among the heralds and musicians, and as the happy recipients went through the hall announcing in loud voices the amount of the gifts received, Tetzel was able to learn that to the heralds alone as much as four hundred nobles had been given. But at length the Earl of Warwick—if Warwick it was who presided that day—rose from the table, and knowing that the strangers were eager to see all there was to be seen, he led Rozmital and his friends into another hall, most magnificently bedecked, where the queen sat at table in solitary grandeur upon a golden chair. Even the queen's mother and the king's sister were required to keep at a deferential distance and kneel if spoken to. Not until the first course had been served and the queen had drunken water were her mother and sister-in-law allowed to sit down, and even then the other ladies remained on their knees. Three hours the ladies kneeled, as all that time the dinner lasted, and not a word was uttered by the haughty queen or by her guests; and when at last the tables were removed and the dancing began, the queen, still sitting in her golden chair, looked on, while her mother knelt before her, standing up only now and then to rest her tired muscles. The dancing lasted some time, and among the many noble ladies who took part in it was the king's sister, who danced with a couple of dukes, making many curtsies before the queen meanwhile. But at last everyone was tired, and then the king's minstrels—than whom better singers, Tetzel was convinced, were not to be heard in all the world—came to close the festivities with their music.

To finish the story Tetzel tells, two earls, as well as the king, feasted the Lord of Rozmital and his party while they remained in London, and although the names of the earls are not given, the sixty courses laid before the guests on one of the occasions—ten more, be it noted, than had been served at the king's banquet—and the exceedingly costly carpets which caught their attention, leave little room for doubt that Warwick was the host that day. In return for all this hospitality the Bohemians invited some of the English lords and knights to dine with them, and the Englishmen found the customs of Bohemia quite as novel as the Bohemians had found those of England. But with all the attentions the visitors received, one of their desires was not granted. They were ambitious to display their strength and skill in the lists and proposed a tournament, but Edward, who no doubt had heard of the wonderful feats they had performed at the court of Burgundy and perhaps feared to see his own subjects too far outdone, declined the offer. This was a great disappointment to the Bohemians, but they accepted the king's decision with a good grace and magnanimously presented him with their tilting horses and all the rest of their jousting paraphernalia. On leaving London, they visited Windsor to see the sights of the castle and to be feasted once more by the knights of the Garter. Then they went to Salisbury, where they spent Palm Sunday and where the Duke of Clarence, who happened to be there at the time, did the honours. Finally they took ship at Poole and sailed for Brittany.[1]

The grandeur and hauteur of the queen of England had filled Tetzel with surprise. Even wise heads have been known to be turned by a sudden elevation in rank, and Elizabeth Woodville's head, which was not wise, had evidently been badly turned. Worse still, love seemed to have turned her husband's head as well. For, not content with the folly of having married this " widow of England," there was no end to the favours Edward was ready to shower on her undeserving family. It was not enough that one of the queen's sisters had been betrothed to the heir of the earldom of Arundel. The others, too, must be provided with husbands of high degree, and for her sister Katharine, Elizabeth picked out the noble youth residing in her household, the Duke of Buckingham;[2] for her sister Anne, William, Viscount Bourchier, son of the Earl of Essex, and for her sister Eleanor, Anthony Grey of Ruthyn, son of the Earl of Kent. Later on another sister, Mary, was betrothed to Lord Herbert's son, after he had been created Lord Dunster, and, worst of all, by paying the Duchess of Exeter four thousand marks the queen secured as a bride for her son, Sir Thomas Grey, Anne Holland, daughter and heiress of the exiled Duke of Exeter, a maiden who had been promised to Warwick's nephew, the Earl of Northumberland's son.[3]

Nor was it only for her sisters and her son that Elizabeth was looking out. Walter Blount, Lord Mountjoy, treasurer of England, who had served Edward faithfully from the day he first aspired to the throne, was given a thousand marks for his diligence at the time of the queen's coronation and of the baptism of "the Lady Princess" and then asked to resign his office to make room for the queen's father, Lord Rivers. And a few weeks later, on Whit Sunday, the king raised the new treasurer to the rank of an earl with the title of Earl Rivers.[1] As treasurer, Rivers received two hundred marks a year for his attendance on the king's council, five hundred pounds a year for his "diets," and one thousand marks a year "for his reward for his diligent occupation and executing of the said office"; and with his earldom he was granted an annuity of twenty pounds from the issues of the county of Northampton.[2] But far better would it have been for the Woodvilles in the long run, to say nothing of the king himself, if they had been less grasping. For the splendid marriages arranged for the queen's sisters, and even more the one arranged for her son, greatly displeased the Earl of Warwick; the appointment of her father as treasurer displeased not only Warwick but all the lords of the realm, and the bestowal of the earldom on him displeased even the common people of England.[3]

---

[1] Des böhmischen Herrn Leo's von Rozmital Ritter-, Hof-, und Pilger-Reise durch die Abendlande, 37-47, 152-159; Mrs. Henry Cust, Gentlemen Errant, being the Journeys and Adventures of Four Noblemen in Europe during the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries, 29-49. In Issue Roll, Mich. 7 Edw. IV, 31st Oct. is recorded a gift of a hundred pounds to " a Lord of Beame comen unto us, for his expenses and reward."

[2] The king consented to be the godfather of the first son of this marriage and gave as a christening present a gold cup which cost £42 15*s.* Receipt Roll, Mich. 17 Edw. IV, no. 632 (properly a Tellers' Roll).

[3] Worcester, 785-786. For the names of the queen's sisters, see Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 25, and III, 436, and Ramsey, II, 321, note 4. Lord Herbert's daughter was betrothed to the young Viscount Lysle at the same time that Mary Woodville was betrothed to Lord Dunster, and the two marriages were celebrated at Windsor Castle on 19th and 20th January following. Household Accounts 6-7 Edw. IV, Accounts, etc. (Exchequer K. R.), bundle 412, no. 2. Anne Holland died young and Sir Thomas Grey afterwards married Cecily, daughter and heiress of Lord Bonvile. Dugdale, I, 720.

It is impossible not to sympathize with Warwick at this moment, however much one may condemn his subsequent acts. Not only had he exerted himself to the utmost to raise Edward to the throne, but since the battle of Towton he had worked harder than Edward himself to beat back the enemies of the house of York, and everyone within England and without had looked upon him as the real ruler of the kingdom. Then suddenly, when the hard work was finished and his services were less indispensable than they had been, he seemed to be forgotten and set aside—set aside not merely for Lord Herbert, who for some time past had been Edward's most intimate friend but who could be tolerated, as he, too, had fought for the house of York, but set aside for the Woodvilles, who were no better than upstarts and who had clung to the house of Lancaster till the last moment. And yet there is something to be said on Edward's side also. For no doubt Warwick was inclined to presume farther than any subject should, and if the king's new intimates, his wife in particular, were whispering in his ear that the Nevilles enjoyed far too much power and authority,[1] they were not wholly wrong. Warwick's influence did pass the bounds of safety; too many important offices were in his hands; his wealth was too vast, his friends and followers among all classes too numerous. In London especially the earl had gained a dangerous amount of popularity, largely by means of lavish hospitality. When he sojourned in the city, six oxen were served at a single breakfast in his house, and anyone who had an acquaintance among his servants was at liberty to take away as much meat as he could carry on his dagger.[2]

---

[1] Treasurer's account, Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 1st March; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 516; Worcester, 785. See also Household account, Accounts, etc. (Exchequer K. R.), bundle 411, no. 15, from which we learn that the expenses of the king's household rose to £65 6*s*. 9*d* on Whit Sunday because Lord Rivers was that day created an earl. Yet Rivers's charter (Charter Roll 5-7 Edw. IV, m. 14) bore the date 24th May, and so did the grant of his annuity.

[2] Warrants for Issues, 7 Edw. IV, 27th March; Close Roll 6 Edw. IV, m. 5.

[3] Worcester.

Warwick was not the only member of the Neville family who rolled in wealth and catered to the mighty appetites of fifteenth century Englishmen. Into the household ways of John Neville, Earl of Northumberland, we are given no peep, but George Neville, when he was enthroned as Archbishop of York, spread a feast which has been described as "the greatest entertainment that ever subject made, whether we respect the quantity of provisions or the number and quality of the guests." At this wonderful dinner Warwick himself acted as steward for his brother, the Earl of Northumberland as treasurer, Lord Hastings as comptroller, Lord Willoughby as carver, Lord John of Buckingham[3] as cup-bearer, and Lord Greystock and Northumberland's son as keepers of the cupboard. Three hundred tuns of ale, a hundred tuns of wine, and a pipe of hippocras were provided for the drinking of the company, and the sixty-two cooks who were employed in the kitchen must have had plenty of work to do, as one hundred and four oxen, six wild bulls, a thousand "muttons," three hundred and four "veals" and as many "porks," two thousand pigs, more than five hundred stags, bucks, and roes, a dozen porpoises and seals, four hundred swans, a hundred and four peacocks, two thousand geese and as many chickens, a hundred dozen quails, four thousand pigeons, and many other unlucky birds and beasts gave up their lives to furnish the meat and game courses, while the jellies and tarts and custards numbered thirteen thousand, and among the very elaborate "subtleties" was one representing

---

[1] Hall, 265.

[2] Stow, 421.

[3] Son of Humphrey, Duke of Buckingham. He was created Earl of Wiltshire on 5th January, 1470.

Saint George, another his dragon, another Samson, and another Saint William.[1] Such colossal hospitality as this the dullest man who ate the archbishop's viands must have felt was fitting only for a king.

But while it might be well to put a check on the wealth and power of the Nevilles, the undertaking was a very delicate one, especially for a king who owed them so much; and in Edward, unfortunately, there was no adroitness and much thoughtlessness, while in the Woodvilles, under whose influence he seemed to be falling more completely every day, there was only blind and selfish ambition. Vaguely resentful because Warwick seemed to overshadow him and only half realizing what he was doing, Edward allowed himself to be drawn away from the earl more and more, until the wound which his secret marriage had made in the earl's heart festered beyond hope of healing. Nevertheless, the Woodvilles were not directly responsible for the open breach that finally came about between Edward and Warwick. It was Warwick's determination to shape England's foreign policy as he, not the king, saw fit that was the real cause of trouble.

Now that England seemed to be growing strong again after so many years of disastrous foreign war and domestic upheaval, many of the continental states were showing a desire to secure her friendship. The embassies received from Castile, Aragon, and Catalonia, the treaty of alliance signed with Denmark, the visitors coming from Poland and Bohemia, are all evidence that, with Edward's reign, England had entered upon a new era in her foreign relations and from now on was likely to play an important part in European politics. Even the Emperor Frederick, perhaps in consequence of what the Lord of Rozmital reported, roused himself so far as to send to England, first a herald, whom Edward rewarded with ten marks in money, a collar of silver and gilt, and thirteen yards of velvet ingrain, and then, a little later, in December, 1466, a more important envoy, the Patriarch of Antioch.[2] What the Patriarch's special errand was no one states, but he brought to the king of England as a present four dromedaries and two camels which were the first creatures of their kind, according to John Stone of Canterbury, that had ever been seen in England. As menageries were becoming a hobby among the continental princes, the Emperor probably believed these strange beasts of burden from the desert would be the most acceptable gift which he could possibly send to the king of England. And perhaps the Emperor was right; for if Edward was not as ardent a lover of animals, both wild and tame, as Louis XI, or even Philip of Burgundy, at least he cared enough for them to import coursers from Castile for his stables and lions from Barbery and Aragon to be kept, as was the custom, at the Tower,[1] and also to welcome at some time in his reign a brief visit from an elephant, which came we know not whence and went we know not whither.[2] So the sum of £406 16*s.* 4*d.* which was paid to the Patriarch of Antioch by the king of England's order probably covered not merely his expenses during his sojourn in Edward's kingdom but also a specially generous reward for the dromedaries and the camels.[3]

---

[1] Leland's Collectanea (Hearne's edition, London, 1770), VI, 1-14. Cf. Worcester, 785, Drake, Eboracum, 444, and Archæologia, I, 172-174.

[2] Treasurer's account, Warrants for Issues, 7 Edw. IV, 20th Jan.; Issue Rolls, Easter 7 Edw. IV, 8th April, and Mich. 7 Edw. IV, 9th Nov.; Chron. of John Stone, 97; Gregory, 235.

In the troubled politics of the Italian peninsula Edward had had no special reason to be interested since the Angevin cause in Italy had been definitely abandoned by the king of France. Nevertheless, his relations with Ferdinand of Naples, the rival of the Angevins, had been growing more and more cordial. In the autumn of 1464 Ferdinand had sent a certain prelate to England who, to Louis' displeasure, interested himself in the negotiations then going on between Edward and the king of Castile.[4] About a year later some noble Neapolitans visited England, were entertained at the king's expense, and went home laden with rich gifts:[5] and not long after a king-of-arms, Jerusalem, arrived with some message from Ferdinand—perhaps the news of the death of Francesco Sforza and the accession of his son, Galeazzo Sforza, to the ducal throne of Milan, or possibly some information relating to the league which was believed to exist between Venice and the Angevins. Finally, in

---

[1] See Warrants for Issues, 4 Edw. IV, 22nd Feb., 5 Edw. IV, 17th April, 9 Edw. IV, 9th May, and 18 Edw. IV, 7th June. The keeper of the lions, lionesses, and leopards at the Tower was paid 12*d.* a day, besides 6*d.* a day for the "sustentation" of each of his charges. Rolls of Parl., V, 475.

[2] Ross, Historia Regum Angliæ, 212.

[3] Treasurer's Account, *ut sup.* Edward seems to have been kind enough, later on, to send one of the camels or dromedaries to Ireland. Annals of the Four Masters, IV, 1081.

[4] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 113. Ferdinand denied that he sent this prelate to England or that he had given him orders to interfere in the negotiations between Edward and the king of Castile. Mandrot, Dépêches, II, 252, note 2.

[5] Treasurer's account, Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 1st March; Tellers' Roll, Mich. 5 Edw. IV.

April, 1467, Edward bestowed the Garter, which Ferdinand himself already wore, on Ferdinand's chamberlain and favourite, Inigo d'Avalos, Count of Monte Odorisio, and at or about the same time he agreed to an " amity and league with intercourse of merchandise " with Naples.[1]

There was one other Italian prince with whom Edward exchanged courtesies. In the summer or autumn of 1467 Borso d'Este, Marquis of Ferrara, who, like Ferdinand of Naples, was an opponent of the Angevin pretensions in Italy, sent one " Charles of Ferrara " to England. The object of this gentleman's visit is as much of a mystery as that of the Patriarch of Antioch's, but what he came to say must have been of pleasing purport, as Edward presented him with a hundred marks in money, " an whole piece of scarlet," and a gray horse that cost ten pounds.[2]

But if Edward was pleased and flattered by the coming of all these visitors from afar, after all it was the doings of his immediate neighbours that concerned him most. About Scotland he seemed to have little cause to worry now, since James had signed so long a truce with him and the Bishop of St. Andrews had been gathered to his fathers. But every act of the rulers of France and Burgundy concerned him deeply, and even when his thoughts appeared to be turned towards other parts of Europe, as when he was negotiating with the king of Castile, he was generally thinking about Louis and Philip. And it was just here, upon the all important question of what policy was to be pursued towards France and Burgundy, that Edward and Warwick found themselves at variance.

From the day Louis became king of France, Philip of Burgundy had worked hard to establish peace between France and England, and the truce which Edward and Louis had signed in October, 1463, had been negotiated through his efforts and within his domains. Edward had had every reason to think, therefore, during the first years of his reign, that he could do nothing which would give greater pleasure to the friend who had helped him in his time of need than to agree to a treaty of peace with France. But by degrees Philip had learned the true character of the man whose coronation at Rheims he had witnessed with high hopes for the future, and when his health failed and his son Charles, whose hatred of Louis had been intense from the first, took the task of government upon his own shoulders, it became evident that the king of England would have to choose between friendship with Burgundy and friendship with France.

---

[1] Rolls of Parl., V, 622 ; Beltz, Order of the Garter, xxi-xxiii. The Garter, which cost £8 13*s.* 4*d.*, was carried to the Count of Monte Odorisio by Robert Donne. Treasurer's account, *ut sup.;* Issue Roll, Mich. 7 Edw. IV, 9th Nov.

[2] Treasurer's account, *ut sup.;* Issue Roll, Mich. 7 Edw. IV, 31st Oct. ; Warrants for Issues, 8 Edw. IV, 2nd July ; Gregory, 235.

In view of his personal debt to Philip, as well as in view of the old enmity between England and France and the close commercial bond between England and the Netherlands, it seemed almost a foregone conclusion that Edward would prefer Burgundy to France. Nevertheless, his choice was not as easy to make as it looked. To begin with, there was no certainty as yet that the Count of Charolais, who would evidently soon be Duke of Burgundy and whose preference for the house of Lancaster no one had forgotten, really wanted to enter into an alliance with him. To be sure, Charles had made some advances when he was forming his league against Louis, but apparently even then his friendship for Henry and Margaret had led him to withhold a definite offer of alliance. In the second place, while the king of France was hated in England, the Duke of Burgundy was not loved; and unless Philip's edict against English cloth was revoked, the powerful merchant class of England was not likely to look with favour on any tightening of the alliance with Burgundy. In the third place, Louis might outbid Burgundy. He might make offers by which an alliance with France would promise to become more valuable to England than her alliance with Burgundy; and though Edward himself might be inclined to distrust and disdain Louis' offers, Warwick, it was already evident, would throw the whole weight of his influence on the side of acceptance. In the end, however, the Count of Charolais took a step that determined the course of events.

In spite of first appearances, the war of the League of the Public Weal had been a failure. To purchase peace Louis had had to make a general distribution of gifts, including the restoration of the Somme towns to Burgundy and a reluctant concession of the duchy of Normandy to his brother Charles, Duke of Berry, but the league which had threatened the safety of his throne was broken up, and in a very short time he managed to get the duchy of Normandy into his own hands again. Except for the recovery of the Somme towns, therefore, the Count of Charolais had gained nothing by the great effort against Louis, and as soon as he realized this, he set out to create a new league. The Duke of Brittany was ready to help again, and so was Louis' brother, but Charles had learned that, in order to succeed, he must have the support of other allies than the discontented nobles of France, and he made haste to reopen his negotiations with the king of England.

This time Charles was ready to bid high for Edward's help. In September, 1465, he had lost his wife, Isabella of Bourbon, and since then he had been looking about for another to take her place. Louis had promptly offered his daughter Anne, although she was a child of only four years, and Charles had actually been tempted to accept this baby bride for the sake of the promised dot—twelve hundred thousand gold crowns with the county of Champagne as security. But it soon became evident that Louis' offer had not been made in good faith, and then Charles decided to apply for the hand of Edward's sister Margaret, who, as he had probably heard, was a lady of very unusual beauty and accomplishments. A marriage with a princess of the house of York was far from being to his taste—in fact, it was " contre son coeur et contre sa nature " —but the help of England he must have; and early in 1466 he sent Guillaume Clugny to England to talk the matter over with Edward. He gave Clugny no authority to clinch a bargain, however, but merely to suggest a possibility, to dangle a tempting morsel before Edward's eyes.[1]

Edward rose at once to the bait Charles threw out to him and showed every readiness to become an active partner in the league against the king of France. First of all, he signed a new twelvemonths' truce with Charles's ally, Francis II, who had sent the Abbot of Bégard, Jean de Launay, and other ambassadors to England about the time Clugny came;[2] and then, on 22nd March, he commissioned Warwick, Hastings, Wenlock, Whetehill, Kent, and others to go to Burgundy and negotiate with Philip and Charles. These ambassadors were not only to treat regarding the marriage between

---

[1] Hist Croy. Cont., 551; La Marche, III, 26-35; Chastellain, V, 311-312, 419; Basin, II, 167-170, 183; Commynes, I, 49-50. Clugny must have reached England before 1st March, as he received a reward of 100 marks from Edward before that date. See Treasurer's account, Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 1st March. According to Commynes, Charles sent him to England soon after the battle of Montlhéri, which would mean before the death of Isabella of Bourbon!

[2] For gifts and payments for expenses made to the Breton ambassadors, see Treasurer's account, *ut sup.*, Issue Roll, Easter 6 Edw. IV, 5th and 19th May, and Tellers' Roll, Mich. 5 Edw. IV. The new truce was not promulgated until 30th April. Rymer, XI, 567. Vincent de Kerleau, Abbot of Bégard, became Bishop of Léon in 1472 and died in 1476.

Charles and the Lady Margaret and the revocation of the act of parliament prohibiting the importation of Burgundian products into England, which Charles had probably mentioned as a *sine qua non*, but also to propose a marriage between the Duke of Clarence, now a youth of sixteen, and Charles's daughter Mary, a child of nine years.[1] However, either Edward was a little suspicious that Charles's offer was not sincere or else Warwick argued with him to some effect; for he also gave his ambassadors authority to treat with the king of France for a perpetual peace or truce and even, there is reason to believe, secret instructions to sound Louis about the possibility of finding some other advantageous marriage for Margaret which would be more to his liking than the Burgundian one.

The negotiations with Burgundy began at St. Omer, whither the Count of Charolais sent the Bastard of Burgundy to meet the English ambassadors; but on 15th April Warwick and his entire suite went to Boulogne, where they spent three days with Charles himself.[2] This appears to have been the first time Warwick and Charles had met face to face, and unfortunately Warwick took a violent and lasting dislike to the count which was probably due in part to his knowledge that Charles stood in the way of the realization of his wishes in regard to France and in part to the clash of one intense nature against another.[3] Considering this, it is not surprising that the earl and the count parted without coming to any kind of an agreement.

The negotiations with France took place at Calais, and as in this case Warwick was eager for success, some progress was made. Louis sent a large number of ambassadors, including the Seigneur de la Barde, Louis, Bastard of Bourbon, admiral of France, and an uncle of Elizabeth Woodville, Louis de Luxembourg, Count of St. Pol, a man who had fought against Louis in the war of the League of the Public Weal but had since repented and been made constable of France. And to disarm any suspicion which might be lurking in the minds of Philip and Charles, Louis ordered his ambassadors to go to Charles on their way to Calais, show him their instructions, and give him to understand that they would follow his advice in all they did.[1]

---

[1] Rymer, XI, 562-565. As early as 15th March orders were given for the payment of £200 to Warwick for the passage and repassage of himself and his fellow ambassadors. Warrants for Issues, 6 Edw. IV, 15th March.

[2] Du Clercq, liv. V, c. lviii; Commynes-Lenglet, II, 187. Cf. Worcester, 784, who, however, as already stated, confuses the negotiations of this and the preceding year.

[3] Hist. Croy. Cont., *ut sup.* Cf. Vergil, 653.

In the midst of the negotiations at Calais, which went on for several weeks, Louis, either to deceive Charles or because he wanted an excuse for calling an army into the field, pretended to believe that the English were about to descend on Normandy. On 4th May he ordered the Count of St. Pol to call out the *ban* and *arrière-ban*, while Charles, not to be outdone, also set about assembling an army and gave out that he was going to assist the king of France to resist the English.[2] In spite of all this, however, on 24th May another brief truce between England and France—to begin on land on 15th June and on sea on 15th July and to last until 1st March, 1468—was signed by Warwick and Louis' ambassadors; and it was also agreed that there should be another meeting of French and English ambassadors at Dieppe on 15th October to treat for a final peace.[3] Louis had promised that, in the meantime, he would give no aid to Margaret of Anjou against Edward, while Edward's ambassadors had promised for him that he would give no aid to the Count of Charolais and the Duke of Brittany against Louis.[4] More than that, a rough draft of a treaty of peace between England and France had been drawn up which provided that Louis should pay Edward forty thousand gold crowns a year during the truce and should also arrange a marriage for Margaret of York. Four possible mates for Margaret were mentioned: first, the new Duke of Milan, Galeazzo Sforza; second, René d'Alençon, Count du Perche; third, Philip de Bresse, whom Louis had taken into favour after he had released him from prison; and fourth, the Prince of Piedmont, son and heir of the Duke of Savoy and nephew of Louis' queen. And Louis was to arrange the marriage at his own expense and even furnish the dowry![5]

However much Warwick was in Louis' toils, certainly he had bargained well, and Edward ratified the new truce with France on

---

[1] Journal de Jean Maupoint, 101; Chronique Scandaleuse, I, 155-156; Lettres de Louis XI, III, 87-89.

[2] Du Clercq, *ut sup.*; Commynes-Lenglet, II, 186; Chronique Scandaleuse, I, 158-159; Haynin, I, 64. There is a copy of Louis' order to the Count of St. Pol to call out the *ban* and *arrière-ban* in Record Transcripts, Series II, no. 136. See also Tardif, Monuments historiques (Paris, 1866), II, 487.

[3] Rymer, XI, 568; Palgrave, Kalendars of the Exchequer, III, 7; Legrand collections, MS. français 6973, f. 393; Lettres de Louis XI and Journal de Jean Maupoint, *ut sup.*

[4] Worcester, 785.

[5] MS. français 20,488, f. 22.

7th June.[1] Whether the king would follow the earl farther than this, however, was a question, although the Count of Charolais, who did not realize at once what a dangerous enemy he now had in Warwick, was moving rather slowly. Charles was not pressing his suit for Margaret's hand, and neither was he encouraging Edward to think that he would consent to marry his daughter to the Duke of Clarence. But the Bastard of Burgundy was now planning to go to England for his long-delayed tournament with Lord Scales, and much more than feats of chivalry might result from his visit.

When a Burgundian herald arrived at Windsor Castle to say that the Bastard was ready to come and to ask for a safeconduct for him, the Earl of Worcester immediately drew up a set of rules and ordinances "to be observed and kept in all manner of justes of peace royal;"[2] and on 6th June Edward wrote to the chancellor to prepare a safeconduct for "Sir Anthony, Bastard of Bourgoigne and Earl of Roche," which would be good for half a year and would allow the Bastard to bring with him as many men as he wished and of whatever "estate, nation, or condition so ever they be." But the chancellor, who probably did not relish the prospect of the Bastard's visit and would have been glad to find a way to delay it at least until Warwick got home, demurred at so unlimited a license, and the next day he received another royal order saying that, as he had "deferred to make up a safeconduct for the Bastard of Bourgoigne in such form as we wrote unto you for two causes, one for that the number of his company is not set in certain, another for that our rebels were not excepted," the king wished it understood that he had "set no number in certain" both that the Bastard might not "find thereby any mean of excuse" and because he had promised the Bastard's herald such a safeconduct in the presence of many of the lords of his council. The king said he was willing, however, that the safeconduct should be "made up for one thousand or under," and "as for our rebels," although his chamberlain had understood from the Bastard "that he would none bring with him" and so it had seemed unnecessary to make any exception, the chancellor might except "our English rebels."[3]

Upon receipt of this second order, the chancellor drew up the safeconduct,[4] but as it turned out, a war which the now dying

[1] Rymer, *ut sup.*

[2] Harleian MS. 69, ff. 20-25; Harington, Nugæ Antiquæ (London, 1804), I, 1.

[3] Warrants under the Signet, file 1379, 6th and 7th June, 1466.

[4] French Roll 6 Edw. IV, m. 8.

Philip of Burgundy chose to wage against the town of Dinant necessitated another postponement of the Bastard's coming. The negotiations with Charles, consequently, were checked again for the moment. In the meantime, however, the Duke of Brittany began to sue more anxiously than ever for Edward's friendship, and to receive encouragement. Immediately after promising Louis that he would not assist or give an asylum to any malcontents, Francis had taken Louis' brother, the worst malcontent in France, under his protection, and fearing what Louis might do in consequence, he decided to seek help again from the king of England. On 3rd July Francis's guest, "Charles, son and brother of kings of France, Duke of Normandy," gave his sanction to an English alliance, and ten days later Edward granted a safeconduct for an embassy from Brittany which was to have among its members two men now well known in England, Jean de Rouville and the Abbot of Bégard.[1]

Edward's readiness to negotiate with Francis and the Duke of Normandy was not a happy portent for Warwick's and Louis' wishes. Neither was his continued interest in the king of Castile. At the beginning of August John Gunthorp and Bernard de la Forsse were sent off to Spain again, and to expedite matters they carried with them the text of a treaty of alliance, offensive and defensive, between England and Castile which Edward had drawn up, and even ratified in advance, in the hope that it would prove acceptable to Henry the Impotent.[2] But of even greater moment was it that the Count of Charolais was beginning to suspect that a good deal more had been done at Calais than he had been told about. A copy of the new truce between England and France had been sent to the count at once, but that did not satisfy him, and on 16th August he wrote an insolent letter to Louis in which he accused the king of having entered into an alliance with the English against Burgundy and of having promised to surrender to them Rouen and the Pays de Caux and to assist them to seize Abbeville and the county of Ponthieu. The meeting of French and English ambassadors which was to take place at Dieppe Charles understood to be for the purpose of making the final arrangements about all these matters.[3]

---

[1] Commynes-Lenglet, II, 564, 595-596; French Roll 6 Edw. IV, m. 17.
[2] Rymer, XI, 569-572.
[3] Duclos, Histoire de Louis XI (Paris, 1820), III, 236-237.

Louis, who never allowed his temper to run away with him as Charles was prone to do, replied soothingly to the count's letter. The ambassadors he had sent to Calais, he said, had never been empowered to make such offers to the king of England as Charles had stated, or to seek an alliance with the English, but had merely been instructed—as Charles ought to know, since he had seen their instructions—to agree upon a truce and upon a day and place for the settlement of differences. The purpose of the proposed meeting at Dieppe was only to settle differences, Louis declared, and if his ambassadors had discussed other matters with the English than those he mentioned, they had done so without orders. As for the truce surely Charles could not mean to raise objections to that, since his father had continually advised it and worked for it and he himself had complained at one time of the losses his subjects suffered through the state of war existing between France and England and had requested that a truce should be arranged.[1]

But Charles was sure that Louis' letter was a lying one, and it only made him still more fearful of a league between France and England. Such a league he must prevent at all costs, and though he did not want to marry Margaret of York, he began to fear that by no other means could he make absolutely sure of the king of England. So again he made advances to Edward. And again he found the king only too glad to meet him half-way. On 23rd October Edward and Charles simultaneously put their signatures to a treaty of amity and mutual defence against all men which bound each to be the "bon et loyal ami" of the other, to protect his person and his estate, and to give no aid to his enemies against him.[2] A week later Edward granted another safeconduct for the Bastard of Burgundy, and also one for an embassy which Philip proposed to send to England to make some sort of a settlement about his edict against English cloth. This embassy was to have for its chief the same Seigneur de la Gruthuyse who, as Philip's ambassador to Scotland, had once rendered such kind services to the house of York.[3]

Yet while Charles seemed to be gaining so rapidly, Warwick was pulling hard in the other direction, and as Edward allowed an English embassy to go over to France, probably in time for the meeting at Dieppe,[1] the outcome of the tug-of-war appeared uncertain even now. However, when the time came for the Seigneur de la Gruthuyse to arrive, Edward, though he only half comprehended Warwick's state of mind, was anxious to have the earl out of the way, and he found an excuse for sending him to Newcastle to negotiate with the Scots about breaches of the truce.[2]

---

[1] Lettres de Louis XI, III, 87-91.

[2] For Charles's promise, see Rymer, XI, 580, for Edward's, Cotton MS. Galba B I, f. 211.

[3] Rymer, XI, 573; Waurin, II, 341-342; Du Clercq, liv. V, c. lxiv.

Philip and Charles could not have sent an ambassador more acceptable to Edward than Gruthuyse, and yet, probably because Philip still refused to revoke outright his edict against English cloth, the negotiations with the Burgundian embassy made slow progress. On the first day of January Charles sent further instructions to Gruthuyse by the hands of Olivier de la Marche, the man to whose entertaining memoirs we are indebted for so many accounts of the banquets and tournaments, as well as of the less picturesque events which occurred at the court of Philip of Burgundy. And immediately after La Marche's arrival Edward empowered Stillington (now Bishop of Bath and Wells as well as keeper of the privy seal), Rivers, Hastings, and others to treat for a new truce and intercourse of merchandise with Burgundy.[3] But again Philip's edict probably proved a stumbling-block, for no treaty had been signed when Warwick returned to London, and Edward, on 12th February, granted a safeconduct for an embassy from the king of France.[4]

The ambassadors Edward had sent, or permitted to go, to Louis were no doubt Warwick's emissaries rather than his, but they had lingered at the French king's court for weeks, and the Duke of Milan's eavesdropping ambassador concluded from what he heard that they asked not only for a long truce, but for an offensive alliance against the Count of Charolais. Louis was a little suspicious of the sincerity of the Englishmen's offers, the Milanese wrote home, but he showered favours on them notwithstanding, and when Duke John of Calabria took him to task one day at the dinner table for his friendship with the Earl of Warwick, whom the duke denounced as a traitor to King Henry, he answered pointedly that he had "more reason to speak well of the Earl of Warwick than of many others, not excepting his own relations," as the earl had always been a friend to his crown and had advised against making war on him, whereas King Henry had waged many wars against France. At this John retorted that, if Louis was so fond of Warwick, he would better try to restore Queen Margaret to power, for then he would be even more sure of England than he was now. That it might be possible to bring Margaret and Warwick together was a startling suggestion, and one not to be forgotten, but Louis' only reply at the moment was a mocking question as to what security he could look for. Would they offer him the queen's son as a hostage? he asked. And would they keep their promise, if they gave one? This made John's blood rise, and he exclaimed that if his nephew gave a promise at his request and then failed to keep it, he would have to "reckon with him and with others, and they would fly at him and tear out his eyes."[1]

---

[1] There is no trace of this embassy in the English records, but see Chronique Scandaleuse, I, 167, as well as the letter of the Milanese ambassador about to be quoted.

[2] Rymer, XI, 573. The Burgundian ambassadors were absent from home from 15th December till 23rd July, and they seem to have been conducted from Gravesend to London by Sir John Howard. Waurin, II, 342, note 1; Manners and Household Expenses of Eng., 383. On 19th March, 1467, a reward of £100 was paid to "the sovereign of Flanders and other ambassadors of Bourgogne." Treasurer's account, Warrants for Issues, 7 Edw. IV, 12th Dec. By "the sovereign of Flanders" is probably meant Josse de Halewin, who was a member of the embassy and who held the office of "souverain bailly" of Flanders. Waurin, *ut sup.*

[3] La Marche, I, xlii; Stein, Olivier de la Marche, 38-39; Rymer, XI, 576. Edward presented La Marche with six marks in money and a cup of silver and gilt. See Treasurer's account, *ut sup.*, and Issue Roll, Easter 7 Edw. IV, 6th May, where, by an apparent slip of the pen, La Marche is called "a knight of Bretaigne."

[4] Rymer, XI, 577.

Louis stored up in his mind the hint John of Calabria had given him about Margaret and Warwick, but he still believed that he could get all he wanted with Warwick's aid alone, and at the moment Margaret's brother was talking so excitedly the French ambassadors for whom Edward had granted a safeconduct were preparing to go over to England.

The Bastard of Bourbon and Jean de Popincourt were the leading members of Louis' embassy, and when they and their companions reached London, it looked as if what the sword had failed to settle at Montlhéri was about to be fought out in a hand to hand diplomatic battle. Unfortunately the means to follow the progress of the fight from day to day are lacking, but it is evident that, while the Burgundian ambassadors continued to lure Edward on by encouraging him more and more to hope that Charles would marry his sister, Warwick succeeded in obtaining at least a hearing for

---

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 117-118.

Louis' ambassadors. The Burgundians probably told themselves the victory was theirs when, about the middle of April, the Bishop of Salisbury, William Hatclyf, and Thomas Vaughan were sent to Bruges to treat with Charles regarding the marriage and the alliance of which it was to be the seal.[1] But the Frenchmen seemed to have almost as much reason to feel elated when Edward, with his own hand, wrote a letter to Louis in which he promised to send Warwick to France before 8th May and then, on 6th May, actually commissioned Warwick, Wenlock, Sir Robert Harcourt, Thomas Kent, and Thomas Colt to go to Louis and treat with him for a perpetual peace or truce.[2]

As soon as he received Edward's letter, Louis eagerly dispatched a safeconduct for Warwick, and about the time the Bishop of Salisbury, Hatclyf, and Vaughan were starting for Burgundy he was giving the Duke of Milan to understand that, with Warwick's help, he had arrived at a secret agreement with the king of England by which Edward was to renounce his claims to the throne of France and be his brother-in-arms henceforth and forever. According to Louis' story, Warwick was to be rewarded by the marriage of his daughter to the Duke of Clarence, Margaret of York was to marry Philip of Bresse, and to Edward's second brother, the Duke of Gloucester, was to be given the hand of Louis' second daughter, who was to have for her dowry part of the territories of the Duke of Burgundy and the Count of Charolais. For it was part of the agreement, Louis asserted, that he and Edward were to unite in waging a war of extermination against Philip and Charles at the end of which they would divide the spoils between them, Edward taking for his brother Holland, Zealand and Brabant, and Louis himself all the rest. As soon as everything was settled, as it would be while Warwick was in France, Louis said, the joint war against Burgundy was to begin.[3]

But in reality Louis was by no means as sure of the future as he wanted the Duke of Milan to think he was. For he had learned one truth, if no more, since his ambassadors went to London. He had learned that Warwick's influence in England was not quite as great as he had supposed it to be. The earl was certainly his friend, but just as certainly Edward was getting out of control, and, consequently, while the Bastard of Bourbon and Jean de Popincourt were fencing with the Burgundian ambassadors in London, Louis' mind had kept reverting to John of Calabria's words. If Edward could not be brought to reason, there remained that other possibility. And about the beginning of May, when he heard that Warwick was coming to France, Louis invited Margaret of Anjou to come and stay at his court. On 19th May the Duke of Milan's ambassadors wrote from Chartres: "It is asserted that the Earl of Warwick will come here and soon. His Majesty will go to Rouen to meet him. There is a fresh report that M. Charolais has again opened secret negotiations to take King Edward's sister to wife, confirming once more the old league with the English. If this takes place, they have talked of treating with the Earl of Warwick to restore King Henry in England, and the ambassador of the old queen of England is already here."[1]

---

[1] French Roll 7 Edw. IV, m. 18, 14th April; Signed Bills, file 1498, no. 4190. For proof that the negotiations took place at Bruges, see Gilliodts-van-Severen, V, 462. John Paston bought a horse on the first day of May with the agreement that if the marriage of Charles and Margaret took place within two years, he would pay six marks for it, but otherwise only forty shillings. Paston Letters, IV, 277.

[2] Rymer, XI, 578.

[3] See a letter written to the Duke of Milan from Blois on 18th April. Cal. Venetian Papers, I, 117-118; Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 118-120.

Louis' ambassadors stayed so long in London that their entertainment cost the king of England more than five hundred pounds, including a hundred and fifty-two pounds spent for "fine Bourgogne wine" for their consumption;[2] and when at last they started for home, they were accompanied not only by Warwick, Wenlock, Harcourt, and Colt, but by the Bishop of Aberdeen, who was probably going along to remind Louis of Scotland's claims on his friendship and her right to be taken into consideration in any final settlement that he might make with England.[3] The whole party sailed from Sandwich for Honfleur on 28th May,[4] and on that very day Louis, at Rouen, was inditing open letters to his subjects in which he announced that the Earl of Warwick was coming, by permission of the king of England, to meet him at Rouen and to treat about several matters affecting the welfare both of England and of France. He rejoiced in the prospect of the earl's visit, he said, as he hoped to make a settlement advantageous to his kingdom and his subjects, and also to prevent the dangers and inconveniences that would arise should the Count of Charolais marry the king of England's sister, as it was said he desired to do, and, in defiance of the treaty of Arras, enter into an alliance with the English.[1]

---

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 120.

[2] Treasurer's account, Warrants for Issues, 7 Edw. IV, 12th Dec.; Issue Roll, Easter 7 Edw. IV, 13th July.

[3] Chron. of John Stone, 99; Beaurepaire, Notes sur six voyages de Louis XI à Rouen (Précis analytique des travaux de l'Académie Imperiale des Sciences, etc., de Rouen, Rouen, 1856), 326.

[4] Chron. of John Stone.

But again Louis was writing more sanguinely than the facts justified. Warwick was actually on his way to France, it was true, but the Frenchmen who were coming home with him had not left England in a wholly satisfied frame of mind. For if the Bastard of Bourbon and Jean de Popincourt did not know that a few days before Edward said farewell to them he had extended his truce with the Duke of Brittany until 1st March, 1468,[2] they did know that the Bishop of Salisbury, Hatclyf, and Vaughan were still at the Burgundian court, and also that great preparations were being made in London for the long anticipated tournament between the Bastard of Burgundy and Lord Scales. Moreover, as they were passing through Canterbury on their way to Sandwich they came face to face with Alphonso de Palenzuela, Bishop of Ciudad Rodrigo, who was going to London to finish the negotiations for a treaty of alliance between England and Castile.[3]

Weeks before Warwick and the French ambassadors departed from London the Earl of Worcester and the heralds had been sent into the city to choose a convenient place for the great tournament.[4] West Smithfield was chosen, and as early as the last day of April Edward had warned the sheriffs that, as the Bastard of Burgundy and Lord Scales were "appointed and agreed to do certain feats of arms within this our realm of England within right short time," they must have the lists and bars ready within nine days.[5] But though many loads of gravel, of " water sand " from the Thames, and of timber to build the king's stage were hurriedly carried to Smithfield, the nine days the sheriffs had been given for their preparations grew to thirty-nine, and Garter King-of-Arms waited at Gravesend three whole weeks before he had the pleasure of going forth in a barge " cleanly beseen " to meet the four " carvels of forestage," gay with pennons, banners, streamers, and hangings of tapestry, which finally brought the Bastard safely from Sluys despite a sharp but victorious encounter on the way with some pirates who called themselves Spaniards but were believed to be hirelings of the king of France.[1]

---

[1] Lettres de Louis XI, III, 143-145. Compare another letter sent out by Louis a little later. *Ibid.*, III, 154-159. The king's purpose in writing these letters seems to have been to check any reports which Charles and Francis might try to set going about the object of his conference with Warwick. Some months before this he had sent to his chancellor for a copy of the article in the treaty of Arras by which Philip of Burgundy was bound not to make treaties with the English without the consent of the king of France. *Ibid.*, III, 79.

[2] Warrants under the Signet, file 1379, 23rd May; Signed Bills, file 1498, no. 4196, 25th May. Cf. Rymer, XI, 605. Jean de Rouville and the Abbot of Bégard had been in England again during the winter. Rymer, XI, 574. Calais Pursuivant and a messenger of the king's chamber were paid 100s. for carrying the proclamation of the new truce with Brittany to "divers parts of England." Issue Roll, Mich. 7 Edw. IV, 13th July.

[3] Chron. of John Stone, *ut sup.*; Daumet, Étude sur l'alliance de la France et de la Castille, 109.

[4] Excerpta Historica, 202.

[5] "The Boke of the Costes and Expenses done uppon the Barrieres in Smythfeld atte th' Acte done betwene the Lord Scales and the Bastard of

When the Bastard sailed up the river the following morning, still attended by Garter, he was met at Blackwall by the Earl of Worcester and a large party of lords, knights, and prominent Londoners in barges gorgeous with hangings of tapestry and cloth of gold. At St. Katharine's he entered one of the barges and was taken to Billingsgate, and from Billingsgate he was escorted to Fleet Street, to the house of the Bishop of Salisbury, who was still at the court of Burgundy and who had put not only his Fleet Street house, which was " richly apparrelled with arras " and " hanged with beds of cloth of gold " for the occasion, at the Bastard's disposal, but also his house at Chelsea, so that the Bastard might have a place in which to " essay his harness secretly."[2]

Three days after the Bastard reached London, Edward, who himself had taken part in a tournament with Lord Scales at Eltham in April,[3] came up from Kingston for the double purpose of welcoming his guest and of opening parliament. A great crowd of noblemen, city officials, and heralds met the king, and to the sound of clarions and trumpets he entered the city, preceded by Scales, who bore the sword of state, and by the constable and earl marshal.[4] After making an offering at St. Paul's, the king rode to Westminster,

---

Bourgogne," Exchequer Accounts, Works, bundle 474, no. 1; Foreign Roll 7 Edw. IV, m. 9 dorso. Cf. Archæologia, XXIX, 135.

[1] Du Clercq, liv. V, c. lxv; Excerpta Historica, 197. One of the knights who came with the Bastard was Pedro Vasques de Saävedra, a Castilian who had been in the service of the Duke of Burgundy for some time past and who had already visited England at least once and received from Edward a gift of two gold cups. Waurin, II, 51, note 1; La Marche, I, 295-296; Issue Roll, Mich. 7 Edw. IV, 9th Nov., and 20th Feb.

[2] Excerpta Historica, 197-198.

[3] Paston Letters, IV, 275.

[4] Sir John Howard acted as deputy marshal, in place of the Duke of Norfolk, during the tournament and at an expense of two or three hundred marks to himself. Manners and Household Expenses of Eng., 170, 468.

and as the cavalcade passed through Fleet Street, Lord Scales, who was still bearing the sword, and who suddenly felt that someone's eyes were fixed upon him, turned quickly in his saddle. and looked for the first time into the face of the man he was so soon to meet in one of the famous tournaments of history. On the following day, Wednesday, 3rd June, the Bastard had an audience with the king, and when, later in the same day, parliament was opened in the Painted Chamber, the Bastard and his company of knights were among the spectators. Scales, in the meantime, had gone down to Greenwich, but on Friday he came up the river attended by many noblemen, was met at St. Katharine's by the constable and the earl marshal, and then, arrayed in a long gown of cloth of gold tissue and with his coats of arms borne before him by a herald and a pursuivant, rode through the city to Holborn, where lodgings " richly beseen with rich arras of silk and cloths of gold " had been prepared for him in the Bishop of Ely's house.[1]

Although both champions were now in the city, several days were still to elapse before the tournament began, and Edward chose this moment, apparently to give his act the greater significance, to deal a blow at the Nevilles. For some time past he had suspected that the Archbishop of York was secretly angling for a cardinal's hat, and his suspicions had probably been brought to a climax by the archbishop's eagerness to confer with a papal legate who had recently been in London on some mysterious errand and who would " never come at no feasts nor dinners with no man, with king nor lord, save with great instance he rode to the Moor with the Archbishop of York and dined there and come home to his bed."[2] At any rate, the day parliament was opened the chancellor of England, owing to illness real or feigned, had been unable to be present to deliver the customary address, and on the following Monday Edward rode to his house near Charing Cross and demanded the great seal, which, after being left for a few days in the hands of Robert Kirkham, was consigned to the care of Robert Stillington, Bishop of Bath and Wells, who resigned the privy seal to Thomas Rotheram, Archdeacon of Canterbury.[3]

[1] Excerpta Historica, 198-200; Worcester, 786.

[2] Gregory, 235-236. Evidently the legate did not stay long in England, as Edward gave him only £15 7*s.* 2*d.* for his expenses. Issue Roll, Easter 7 Edw. IV, 1st May; Treasurer's account, Warrants for Issues, 7 Edw. IV, 20th Jan.

[3] Rolls of Parl., V, 571; Worcester, 786-787; Rymer, XI, 578. Almost

Two days after the great seal was taken from George Neville, parliament was adjourned for the week-end so that the members might have the pleasure of witnessing the tournament which had been looked forward to so long,[1] and on Thursday, 11th June, the great event began in the presence of the king and of everyone who could crowd himself into West Smithfield. Clothed in purple, wearing the Garter, and holding in his hand a warder or baton, Edward sat on the spacious king's stage with his councillors gathered about him, with an earl holding the sword before him, a little to one side, and with three tiers of knights, esquires, and archers seated below him; and Olivier de la Marche, who saw the king that day, declares that he looked well worthy of his royal office—"car it était un beau prince, et grand et bien amanieré."[2] On the opposite side of the field, on a stage not so high as the king's, sat the mayor and aldermen of London, while at each corner of the field, which was ninety yards in length by eighty in breadth, stood a king-of-arms crowned and within the field, near the stairway of the king's stage, the constable and earl marshal and many other officers of arms.

When the king and all the other spectators had taken their places and everything was in readiness, Lord Scales rode up to the bars followed by nine attendants, "richly trapped and beseen," and preceded by the Duke of Clarence and the Earl of Arundel, each bearing a helmet, and by the Duke of Buckingham, the Earl of Kent, and Lords Herbert and Stafford bearing the weapons, two spears and two swords. Halted at the bars by the constable and the earl marshal, who demanded to know why he had come, Scales answered that it was his wish "to accomplish and perform the acts comprised in articles by him unto the Bastard of Burgundy sent," and thereupon the king commanded him to enter the field. After entering the field and doing reverence before the king, Scales withdrew to a pavilion of "double blue satin with his letters," while the Bastard in his turn rode up to the bars with the Duke of Suffolk bearing his helmet, was admitted to the field, did reverence before the king, and then withdrew to his pavilion, where he

---

the first document to which Kirkham affixed the great seal was an order to the treasurer and barons of the Exchequer to honour all reasonable bills which the sheriffs of London might present for their expenses in preparing for the tournament in West Smithfield and to credit them accordingly in their account. Writs of Privy Seal, file 811, no. 2081.

[1] Excerpta Historica, 199.

[2] La Marche, III, 49.

"helmed him openly." In the meantime the spears and swords were brought out, and when they had been approved by the counsel for both parties and sent to the Bastard for his choice, proclamation was made at the four corners of the field that Lord Scales and the Bastard of Burgundy were about to perform certain deeds of arms "for the augmentation of martial discipline and knightly honour necessary for the tuition of the Faith Catholic against heretics and miscreants and to the defence of the right of kings and princes and their estates public," and that no man, upon pain of imprisonment, fine, and ransom at the king's will, should approach the lists without cause or make any noise or demonstration of any kind by which the combatants might be either "troubled or comforted."

At last a herald cried "Laissez aller!" and the combat began. But alas! in the first on-rush the Bastard's horse struck his head against a sharp point of Scales's saddle, reared, and fell back dead, dragging his rider to the ground, and even the king instantly decided that Scales had been guilty of bad faith. It had been agreed beforehand, in accordance with the ordinary rules of the tourney and with the Earl of Worcester's ordinances ("who so striketh a horse shall have no prize"), that neither party should intentionally injure the other's horse, and when the Bastard's counsel had also moved that neither party should "charge with an horse the which was terrible to smite or bite, through the which the one party might prevail against the other and take advantage by the horse," Scales's counsel had answered for him that he had no wish to "advantage himself by the mean of horse, but by his hands and due mean of knighthood." Nevertheless, Scales had seemingly won "by the mean of horse," and the king's anger was not stilled until his brother-in-law removed the trappings from his horse and showed that there was no unlawful armour hidden beneath.[1] The Bastard was then asked if he wished to take another horse, but he replied that "it was no season," and no more fighting took place that day. The Bastard said to La Marche, however: "Do not worry. To-day he has fought a beast, but to-morrow he shall fight a man."

The events of the second day proved that the Bastard's boast was no idle one. This time the fighting was done on foot and the weapons were axes and daggers, as the king threw aside the "casting spears" which Scales had brought, saying that "in as much as it was but an act of pleasaunce, he would not have none such mischievous weapons used before him." Scales entered the field shouting "Saint George! Saint George! Saint George!" and he and the Bastard assailed each other with such energy and courage that even La Marche, who had witnessed many and many a tournament, declares that never in his life had he seen so fierce a combat with axes. In fact, the struggle waxed so hot that the king put an end to it by casting down his warder and shouting "Whoa!" Then, without allowing the exhausted heroes to fight with daggers, Edward commanded them to take each other by the hand and "love together as brothers in arms"; and when they had exchanged "as courteous, goodly, and friendly language as could be thought," they "went together into the midst of the field" and then departed each to his own lodging. According to La Marche, Scales's armour showed great gashes made by the Bastard's axe, but the English chroniclers claim that Scales had really won the victory before the king interfered.[1]

---

[1] Even La Marche, though of course his sympathies were with the Bastard, exonerates Scales from blame. Hall accounts for the accident by saying that the Bastard was "somewhat dim of sight."

Lord Scales and the Bastard had now accomplished their feats of arms, but on Saturday Louis de Bretaylle fought on foot with Jean de Chassa, a knight to whom he had sent a challenge in the preceding year by the herald who came for the Bastard's safe-conduct, and on Sunday they fought again on horseback.[2] Sunday evening the Bastard and all his company were feasted by the king and queen at supper in the Grocers' Hall,[3] and the gallant La Marche states that he saw there sixty or eighty ladies "of such noble estate that the least noble was the daughter of a baron," and that the supper was "great and plentiful." On Monday Philip Bouton, first esquire to the Count of Charolais, met Sir Thomas de la Lande in the lists, and the tiltings and the feastings were to have gone on for another week, ending with a dinner which the Bastard was planning to give on Sunday in honour of the queen and her sisters and many other ladies and for which he was already making great preparations. But suddenly came news which turned all the gaiety into mourning. It was the word that Philip of Burgundy had died at Bruges on Monday evening, 15th June, while the Count of Charolais hovered over him in an agony of grief. On the 24th, consequently, the Bastard took a sorrowful leave of the king and queen of England and all the beautiful English ladies and hurried home to attend his father's funeral.[1] The Seigneur de la Gruthuyse, however, remained in London.

---

[1] Excerpta Historica, 203-212; La Marche, III, 48-54. Cf. Worcester, 787, Fabyan, 655-656, Gregory, 236, Kingsford's London Chron., 179, and Haynin, I, 77. Jean de Waurin, as well as La Marche, witnessed the tournament (Waurin, II, 343), but unfortunately he refrains from giving an account of it.

[2] Excerpta Historica, 216-220; La Marche, III, 54-55; Worcester, *ut sup.* Worcester claims that Louis de Bretaylle won the advantage, although the king impartially gave the honour to both contestants. Jean de Chassa took part in the tournaments at Bruges following the marriage of Margaret of York and Charles the Bold. La Marche, III, 154.

[3] La Marche says the banquet was held in the Mercers' Hall, but see Household accounts, Accounts, etc. (Exchequer K. R.), bundle 412, no. 2.

[1] Excerpta Historica, 220-222; La Marche, III, 55-57; Waurin, II, 343; Worcester, *ut sup.*; Gregory, 236. La Marche heard of Philip's death as he was about to embark at Plymouth for Brittany, and at Rennes he was present at a splendid service which Francis II ordered for the repose of the duke's soul. La Marche, I, xliii; Stein, Olivier de la Marche, 39.

CHAPTER IV

GATHERING CLOUDS

WITH the exception of the one week-end which everyone had devoted to the tournament, parliament had continued to sit during the whole of the Bastard of Burgundy's stay in London, and as the Bastard witnessed the ceremonies of the opening day, so also he may have heard the brief speech which the king made two days later when the Commons presented their Speaker, John Say, again.

By this time Edward had become an extensive exporter of wool and cloth, and he was already laying the foundations of the large private fortune which made him, in the last years of his life, one of the wealthiest princes in Europe. Notwithstanding his increasing wealth, however, he had gone on borrowing money, both for his own use and for the expenses of government, from the merchants of Venice and Genoa, and especially from Gerard Caniziani, the agent of the Medici,[1] as well as by forced loans from his own subjects. When demanding loans from his subjects, he had always been careful to address himself, for the most part, to the abbots, priors, and other ecclesiastics of his kingdom;[2] but in spite of that, his people, still clinging to the comfortable doctrine that it was the duty of their sovereign to "live of his own" and still remembering the fair hopes held out to them at the time the Duke of York was struggling for the mastery, were beginning to show unmistakable signs of resentment. So parliament had been summoned mainly because the king desired to announce his intention of turning over a new leaf.

"John Say," said the king in his frank, direct way, "and ye, Sirs, come to this my court of parliament for the commons of this my land, the cause why I have called and summoned this my present parliament is that I purpose to live upon my own and not to charge my subjects but in great need and urgent causes concerning more the weal of themself, and also the defence of them and of this my realm, rather than my own pleasure." Then, after expressing the hope that his hearers would be as kind to him "as heretofore any Commons have been to any of my progenitors," and his thanks for the good-will shown to him in the past, Edward assured his subjects that he would reign as "rightwisely" over them as any of his progenitors had done and would defend them and his kingdom even at the cost of his own life.[1]

---

[1] Receipt Rolls, Mich. 5 Edw. IV, 8th March, and Mich. 6 Edw. IV, 4th Nov.; Issue Roll, Mich. 7 Edw. IV, 26th Oct.; Treasurer's Accounts, Mich. 6 Edw. IV, 12th Nov., and 7 Edw. IV, 11th Dec.; Writs of Privy Seal, file 802, no. 1616, and file 809, no. 1999; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 11.

[2] Issue Roll, Easter, 6 Edw. IV, 5th and 19th May.

The king's gracious words secured for him a new resumption act, and one somewhat more sweeping than that of 1465, as it applied not only to the lands affected by that act, but also to all lands which had come into his hands by the attainder of any person since his accession. But scarcely had the resumption act and a statute prohibiting the exportation of woollen yarn and unfulled cloth been passed and a new arrangement made for paying the garrison at Calais, when the plague broke out in London, several members of the House of Commons died, and on 1st July parliament adjourned in a panic.[2] Even in the midst of such haste, however, the Commons took time to call the king's attention to the need of punishing murders, riots, and other outrages against the law and of providing for the defence of the sea and of Calais, Ireland, and the Scottish marches.

The chancellor tried to set the minds of the Commons at rest by assuring them that all that was necessary for the keeping of the sea and for the protection of Calais and the northern border would be done, that they would soon be told what provision had been made for the safety of Ireland, and that it was the king's intention to see that crime was punished and repressed.[3] But even the chancellor could not deny that there was need for vigorous measures. Perhaps the defences of the kingdom had not really been neglected, but certain it was that pirates were taking heavy toll from English merchantmen at sea and that on land there were troubles everywhere—in Ireland, in Wales, in England itself. It was not only that such crimes as the Commons complained of were occurring with shocking frequency, but high treason itself was forever rearing its head.[1] Although for two years Henry VI had been a prisoner in the Tower, many an Englishman seemed to love him still, and to this day a handful of rebels in Harlech Castle refused to recognize anyone else as their sovereign lord. Lord Herbert's siege of Harlech in the autumn of 1464 had failed completely, and when the Earl of Kent took over the task in the following year, he had succeeded no better. In time the Harlech rebels managed to capture Holt Castle as well, and in the autumn of 1466 Sir Richard Tunstall issued forth in a raid of such daring that even so distant a town as Shrewsbury trembled for its safety. After that the Earl of Worcester was sent to Wales with authority to capture Harlech by any means he chose, but even Worcester, though his reputation for severity was probably expected to have good effect, had found Harlech more than he could cope with.[2]

---

[1] Rolls of Parl., V, 572.

[2] *Ibid.*, V, 572-613, 621-622; Statute 7 Edw. IV, c. 3. The plague seems to have begun its work in England as early as March (Chron. of John Stone, 98), and in November conditions were still so serious in London that the courts had to be adjourned. Signed Bills, file 1499, no. 4213, 17th Nov. (this document is really a council warrant); Close Roll 7 Edw. IV, m. 7. It was also rampant on the Continent and in Ireland. Commynes-Lenglet, II, 190; Annals of Ross (printed in appendix of Annals of Ireland by Friar John Clyn, Dublin, 1849), 262.

In regard to the new arrangement for Calais, see not only Rolls of Parl., V, 613-616, but also French Roll 6 Edw. IV, m. 6, 12, and 29; Issue Roll, Easter 7 Edw. IV, 5th and 19th May; Foreign Roll 7 Edw. IV, m. F; Treasurer's account, Warrants for Issues, 7 Edw. IV, 12th Dec.

[3] Rolls of Parl., V, 618.

Nor was the neighbourhood of Harlech by any means the only district where treason was lurking about. Not many months before this some rebels had been taken in the Isle of Wight,[3] where the influence of the Beauforts probably still made itself felt; and in this or the preceding year Edward's old enemy, Humphrey Neville of Brancepeth, and one Archibald Ridley had been so successful in an attempt to stir up an insurrection in Northumberland that the Earl of Northumberland had to hurry to the scene with a band of archers.[4] All over the kingdom, in fact, a wave of restlessness and disorder seemed to be spreading, so that for several months past the sheriffs had been allowed to use a part of the money coming into their hands for secret-service purposes.[1] Had Sir John Fortescue been in a position to find out the state of things, he might have claimed at this moment with quite as much reason as when he was writing to the Earl of Ormond in Portugal that all that Henry of Lancaster needed to enable him to recover his throne was a few thousand men with "some notable and manly prince or other captain" to lead them. The only question seemed to be where the right captain was to be found. For, given the captain, the few thousand men would speedily present themselves.

---

[1] Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 181. Cf. Gregory, 234, and Rolls of Parl., V, 632.

[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 457, 467; Hist. MSS. Com., Report 15, app., part X, p. 30; Signed Bills, file 1498, no. 4177, 5th Nov., 1466. Cf. Plumpton Correspondence, 17. Worcester was paid £400 for his expedition to Wales. Issue Roll, Mich. 7 Edw. IV, 9th Nov. and 20th Feb.

[3] Treasurer's account, Mich. 6 Edw. IV.

[4] Manuscripts of the Corporation of Beverley, 142; Warrants for Issues, 8 Edw. IV, 30th July—a warrant to pay £200 to the Earl of Northumberland for his expenses in "keeping of our great days of truce at our borders iij times, as in subduing and repressing of our rebels and traitors, Sir Humphrey Neville, Archibald Rydley, and other within the county of Northumberland." Cf. Issue Roll, Easter 8 Edw. IV, 13th July. Ridley had been pardoned by Edward at one time. Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 343.

The very day parliament was adjourned the Earl of Warwick returned to London[2] bringing with him another embassy from the king of France and memories of a very delightful sojourn in Louis' kingdom. Leaving England with a sore heart and a sense of being neglected and superseded, Warwick had found himself a courted, petted, flattered guest from the moment he set foot on French soil. As he sailed up the Seine towards Rouen, he was presented with the keys of the towns he passed, and when, on 6th or 7th June, he arrived at the village of La Bouille, he was welcomed by Louis himself, who had come down the river to meet him. With Louis he entered Rouen a day or two later escorted by twelve canons of the cathedral, and after being conducted by a great procession of clergy to the cathedral to make offerings, they both took up their abode in the Dominican convent, where they could commune with each other daily and in privacy.

Knowing Louis' passionate fondness for the chase, Warwick had brought him some English dogs and horses, and if Edward himself had sent no gifts, at least his friend Herbert had seized the opportunity to make an offering of seven dogs to the king of France. But what were dogs and horses in comparison with the presents Louis gave! Not only did Louis pay all the expenses of Warwick and his two hundred companions and attendants during their entire stay in France, but he gave to the earl a cup of gold which was made at Rouen at a cost of more than two thousand livres and to the earl's steward a dozen silver cups, while he sent six more cups to Lord Herbert in return for his seven dogs and scattered about other costly pieces of plate with a generous hand. A largess of one hundred and fifty pounds was also given to the archers of the company, and another of fifty crowns to the trumpeters, while Warwick Herald got one hundred gold crowns all for himself, and one hundred and twenty crowns were divided among the grooms and pages who had come in attendance on the dogs and horses. Even this was not all. Louis had reasons for wanting the Englishmen to be impressed with the variety and beauty of the textile manufactures of France, and he ordered the silk and woollen merchants of Rouen to supply his guests, at his expense, with anything they expressed a wish for, with the result that every man who had come to France with Warwick went home, when the time came, clad in damask, velvet, or some of the other fine fabrics in the manufacture of which Rouen surpassed all the cities of France.

---

[1] Ramsay, II, 326, note 3.
[2] Worcester, 787.

Probably it was lucky for the merchants of Rouen that Warwick's stay in their city lasted but a few days. The news that Philip of Burgundy was dead or dying seems to have cut short the conferences at Rouen as it cut short the tournaments in London. On 16th June Warwick set out in haste for England, and though there was no time to get a safeconduct from Edward, Louis sent with him a "large and notable" embassy consisting of the Archbishop of Narbonne, the Bastard of Bourbon, Jean de Popincourt, Alexandre Sextre, Louis' *argentier*,[1] Olivier le Roux, and, rather strangely, William Monypenny, who was to go on to Scotland from England. Frightened by the thought that the Count of Charolais was about to become Duke of Burgundy, Louis charged his ambassadors to do all in their power to conclude a treaty of peace between France and England and to prevent the marriage of Charles and Margaret of York.[2]

Warwick and all his companions, French and English, sailed from Honfleur on 23rd June, but as they had to wait at Sandwich until Edward sent a safeconduct for the French ambassadors, they did not arrive in London until 1st July.[3] On 4th July Guillaume

---

[1] Sextre, or Chestre, as he is named in the English records, had evidently been in England in the preceding winter, as Edward had presented him at that time with £20 in money and eighteen yards of velvet. Treasurer's Account, Mich. 6 Edw. IV,

[2] Chronique Scandaleuse, I, 170-172; Basin, II, 178-179; Beaurepaire, Notes sur six voyages de Louis XI à Rouen, 284-334; Archives départ., Seine-Inférieure, II, 234; Lettres de Louis XI, III, 146-149, 154-159.

[3] Chron. of John Stone, 99-100; Waurin, II, 344, note 3; Worcester, 787. Two safeconducts for Louis' embassy, both dated 25th June, are entered on the French Roll, one on m. 18, the other on m. 12. The one on m. 18, which

Picard, one of Louis' officers in Normandy, reported to Jean Bourré, comptroller of finances in Normandy, that the Earl of Warwick had arrived in England, and he added: "Croyez que tout y tremble devant luy, quelque chose que autres en dient."[1] But in spite of what was hoped and expected in France, Edward showed no tendency to tremble before Warwick. On the contrary, Louis' petted guest came home to find not only that the great seal had been taken from his brother during his absence, but that he himself, the Earl of Warwick, the man who had raised Edward of York to the throne, was suspected of treason![2] Louis' reception had been too cordial, too intimate; and perhaps, also, the presence of Margaret of Anjou at the French court had been discovered.

Warwick did not learn the whole unpleasant truth at once. Though the embassy from Louis had come so unexpectedly and though Edward was determined not to let Warwick entangle him further with France, the French ambassadors were received with civility, and they fell heir to the sumptuous quarters in the Bishop of Salisbury's house which the Bastard of Burgundy had just vacated. The day after their arrival the king left the plague-stricken city for the purer air of Windsor, but before his departure he gave them an audience, and they followed him to Windsor on the 15th, to remain there as his guests.[3]

The proposal Louis' ambassadors had brought was truly an amazing one. Louis had realized the necessity of bidding higher than ever now that Charles had become Duke of Burgundy, and he had told his ambassadors to say that if Edward would enter into an alliance with him against Charles, he would consent to submit to the Pope's arbitration the question of the right and title to the duchies of Normandy and Aquitaine and, during the

---

is the one Rymer prints, XI, 580, is for four persons only, namely, the Archbishop of Narbonne, the Bastard of Bourbon, Monypenny, and Olivier le Roux; but the one on m. 12 contains the names of Popincourt and Sextre as well.

[1] Legrand collections, MS. français 6974, ff. 163-164.

[2] Hearne's Fragment, 297, 299; Basin, II, 179.

[3] Worcester and Waurin, *ut sup.*; Household Account, 6 and 7 Edw. IV. Waurin (II, 346-347) would have his readers believe that Edward went away to avoid Louis' ambassadors. But that the Frenchmen, instead of remaining in London to plot with Warwick and Clarence, as Waurin says, followed the king to Windsor is proved both by the household accounts and by the payment of £22 18*s*. to one Robert Chamberlain for conducting them thither. Issue Roll, Easter 7 Edw. IV, 13th July. And as Fogge was allowed £95 for their expenses at Windsor, they must have stayed there some time. Issue Roll, Mich. 7 Edw. IV, 20th Feb.

four years the Pope was to be given to make his decision, would pay Edward four thousand marks a year.[1] It is stated that Louis promised even more than this. It was well known in France that Philip's edict against English cloth had stirred up much ill feeling against Burgundy in England, and according to Jean de Waurin, Louis told Edward that, when Charles had been overthrown by their joint effort, he would abolish the fairs at Antwerp and at all other places in the duke's domains, that he would then establish fairs at such places in France as the English might choose to name, and that he would grant to English merchants greater privileges in his kingdom than French merchants themselves enjoyed.[2] In other words, Louis offered to destroy at a blow the trade and industries of the Netherlands and then, after setting them up again as if by magic in his own kingdom, help English merchants to grow rich at the expense of his own subjects.

But Edward was too wise to be trapped by promises which, however enticing they sounded, he knew would never be kept. Although on 25th July the Duke of Milan's ambassador in France reported that there was good news from England, that Warwick's brother had been made chancellor again with even more power than he had before, and that within a few days an English embassy would arrive to conclude "many good matters,"[3] there was not a word of truth in the story. Not for a moment did Edward think of giving the great seal back to the Archbishop of York, and the only promise Louis' ambassadors were able to get from him was that he would send another embassy to France "en toute diligence" with his final reply to Louis' proposals.[4] It was pretty evident, too, to all who shared the king's confidence, what that final reply would be, as two days after Louis' ambassadors joined him at Windsor he renewed his treaty of amity and mutual defence with Charles, and the Seigneur de la Gruthuyse went home to report that all was well.[5] Moreover, on 6th July the Bishop of Ely and the Bishop of Ciudad Rodrigo had agreed on the terms of a treaty of alliance between England and Castile.[6] So set had Edward's heart become on securing this alliance with Henry the Impotent that, to make sure of it, he had promised to renounce his claim to the throne of Castile. The day after the treaty was signed Edward made a solemn declaration that neither he nor his heirs and successors would ever molest or disturb in any way Henry the Impotent or his heirs and successors legitimately descended from Constance, daughter of Pedro, king of Castile and Leon, through Katharine, daughter of Constance and of John, Duke of Lancaster, in their possession of the realm of Castile and Leon or of any of their other lands and territories.[1] Then, loaded with gifts, including "a great standing cross with a foot of silver and gilt," a chalice, two cruets, a small bell, and a paxbread,[2] the Bishop of Ciudad Rodrigo went home, like the Seigneur de la Gruthuyse, to report that all was well. And Henry the Impotent not only ratified at once the treaty his ambassador had negotiated, but ordered his subjects to assist the English against the French whenever there was occasion to do so.[3] Not long after there was even talk of a marriage between Henry's sister Isabella, whose hand Edward himself had once declined, and one of Edward's brothers.[4]

---

[1] Worcester, *ut sup*.

[2] Waurin, II, 353.

[3] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 120.

[4] See a letter written by Monypenny in the following January. Waurin, III, 191.

[5] Cotton MS. Galba B I, f. 212, 17th July. Gruthuyse reached home on 23rd July. Waurin, II, 342, note 1.

[6] Rymer, XI, 583-590; Palgrave, Kalendars of the Exchequer, III, 10.

Early in August Queen Elizabeth gave birth to another daughter at Windsor Castle. Princess Mary was baptized on 12th August,[5]

The treaty was at once proclaimed in England. Issue Roll, Easter 7 Edw. IV, 13th July. Hall says (p. 266) that, according to report, at the time this treaty was made Edward granted a license for the exportation of some Cotswold sheep to Spain and that these sheep so multiplied and increased that in time Spain profited much at England's expense. Stow quotes this statement and then remarks that in reality there were sheep in Spain long before this time, as a patent obtained by the weavers of London in 31 Henry II required the mayor of London to burn any cloth in which it was found that Spanish wool had been mixed with English wool. But undoubtedly what Hall meant was not that Spain had no sheep before this time, but that the quality of Spanish wool was so improved by the introduction of the Cotswold breed of sheep that it became a dangerous rival of English wool.

[1] Signed Bills, file 1498, no. 4199. (See Appendix VI).

[2] Treasurer's account, Warrants for Issues, 7 Edw. IV, 12th Dec.; Issue Roll, Easter 7 Edw. IV, 8th April. Two knights of Spain who had probably come with the bishop also received some gifts, including a standing cup of silver and gilt and six yards of velvet. Treasurer's account, *ut sup.*; Issue Roll, Mich. 7 Edw. IV, 20th Feb.

[3] Daumet, Étude sur l'alliance de la France et de la Castille, 110; Chastellain, V, 359. See Venetian Papers, I, 121, for a case in which the subjects of Henry the Impotent gave aid to those of Edward IV.

[4] In a letter which Isabella wrote to her brother on 12th October, 1469, she speaks of such a marriage having been under consideration at the time of the convention of Toros de Guisando, August, 1468. Enriquez del Castillo, Cronica de rey Enrique el cuarto, cap. 136 (cited by Prescott, Ferdinand and Isabella, I, 96, note 41).

[5] Worcester, 788; Paston Letters, VI 107; Household Account, 6 and 7 Edw. IV. The Dowager Duchess of Bedford had arrived at Windsor on 16th

and the French ambassadors probably honoured her with their presence on the occasion. Two days later, however, Warwick accompanied the Frenchmen to Canterbury and the next day from Canterbury to Sandwich. Six weeks Louis' "large and notable" embassy had spent in England, and yet the only fruits of their efforts were Edward's promise to send an embassy to France and a collection of gifts consisting, not of gold and silver cups such as Louis had distributed at Rouen, but of hunting horns and leather bottles and some large mastiffs with collars and leashes.[1]

But why should Edward waste valuable gifts on Louis' ambassadors when Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, had signed, on 15th July, a renewal of his treaty of amity and mutual defence with him and had added to it a clause which made it binding not only upon himself, but also upon his heirs and successors?[2] The day Warwick left London to escort Louis' ambassadors to Sandwich Edward called his councillors together to tell them what Charles had done; and with their consent, he decided to bind his heirs and successors to respect the treaty between Charles and himself as Charles had bound his heirs and successors to do, and that a copy of the treaty, with the new clause added to it, should be sent to the Bishop of Salisbury, Hatclyf, and Vaughan for delivery to the duke.[3]

It is hardly surprising that Warwick did not go back to Windsor after bidding farewell to Louis' ambassadors at Sandwich. He was paid two thousand marks for the journeys he had made to the Continent in this and the preceding year, with two hundred pounds in addition for his shipping expenses;[4] but money was no balm to his feelings. From Sandwich he went to Yorkshire,[5] and in

---

July, probably to assist at her daughter's lying-in. Household Account. On 9th October, 1468, the queen was granted £400 a year for the expenses of her two daughters, who resided, during their early years, at Shene under the care of their governess, Margaret, Lady Berners. Rymer, XI, 631; Green, Lives of the Princesses of England, II, 396, 403, note.

[1] Chron. of John Stone, 101; Chronique Scandaleuse, I, 176-177; Hearne's Fragment, 298.

[2] Rymer, XI, 580. Cf. Palgrave, Kalendars of the Exchequer, III, 9.

[3] Cotton MS. Galba B I, f. 211. Another copy of Edward's promise is appended to his ratification of the marriage treaty. See Warrants under the Signet, file 1380.

[4] Treasurer's account, Warrants for Issues, 7 Edw. IV, 12th Dec. Cf. Issue Rolls, Easter 7 Edw. IV, 8th April, 13th May, 13th July, and Mich. 7 Edw. IV, 20th Feb. Harcourt received £80 for accompanying Warwick to "King Louis of France into Normandy" and Wenlock the same amount for accompanying him "beyond the sea to the pretended king of France." Warrants for Issues, 7 Edw. IV, 19th July; Issue Roll, Mich. 7 Edw. IV, 31st Oct.

[5] Worcester, *ut sup.*

Yorkshire he stayed, growing daily more indignant, while Edward plunged deeper into his negotiations with Charles and welcomed an embassy from John of Aragon, whose displeasure Louis had incurred by supporting a campaign the Duke of Calabria was conducting in Catalonia in René of Anjou's name and who, like his neighbour of Castile, had decided to fortify himself with an English alliance.[1]

On 20th September Edward gave commissions to Lord Scales, Lord Hastings, Sir John Scott, Doctor John Russell,[2] and others to go over to Burgundy and, with the help of the Bishop of Salisbury, Hatclyf, and Vaughan, who were already there, treat with Charles for a perpetual peace and league and sign a marriage treaty;[3] and a few days later he made the sacrifice without which, Charles had evidently made him feel, there would never be a marriage treaty. On 28th September the chancellor of England received a warrant under the sign-manual stating that the king, with the advice and consent of his council, declared null and void both the statute of 1463 which prohibited the importation of so many articles derived mainly from the Netherlands and the statute of 1464 which shut out of England all products of the Duke of Burgundy's domains except foodstuffs.[4] Two days later Margaret of York was summoned before the great council at Kingston-on-Thames and in its presence agreed to accept the marriage her brother had arranged for her.[1] Then the king's ambassadors departed for Burgundy, and in a short time they were busily negotiating at Brussels with Charles's mother, Isabella of Portugal, who was well trained for her task, as it was she who had negotiated the treaty of mercantile intercourse with England in 1439.

---

[1] John had sent Sir John Reys (Ruis ?) to England in the summer, perhaps to ask for a safeconduct for the embassy which was to follow, and Edward gave this envoy a "standing cup of silver and gilt." Treasurer's account, *ut sup.*; Issue Roll, Easter 7 Edw. IV, 13th July. The embassy which came later was headed by D. Hugo de Urrea and Francisco Berenguer. Calmette, 291. Vincent Clement, who had carried messages between John and Edward in 1462, was granted a safeconduct to go to divers parts beyond the sea for divers urgent matters on 20th October, and another on 31st January. Writs of Privy Seal, file 815, no. 2257, and file 816, no. 2343; French Roll 7 Edw. IV, m. 11 and 12. In a letter which John wrote to Edward on 21st October, 1468, he mentions receiving letters from him by Clement's hand. Calmette, 542.

[2] Russell, whose name will occur frequently from now on, was at this time Archdeacon of Berks, but he was afterwards Bishop of Rochester and then of Lincoln. Sir Thomas More speaks of him as "a wise man and a good and of much experience, and one of the best learned men undoubtedly that England had in his time."

[3] French Roll 7 Edw. IV, m. 5; Signed Bills, file 1499, no. 4207. Rymer (XI, 590) prints only the commission to treat for the marriage. Hatclyf made no less than five journeys to Burgundy during the negotiations and received £235 for as many days' service, beside small sums for "writings," sending messages, etc. Warrants for Issues, 8 Edw. IV, 20th March. The Bishop of Salisbury remained at the Burgundian court until after the marriage of Charles and Margaret took place. Both La Marche, III, 75-76, and Gregory, 237, speak of his long sojourn there.

[4] Signed Bills, file 1499, no. 4208. Both statutes are quoted at length in the warrant.

But if Edward was now rejoicing in the thought that the Burgundian marriage treaty would soon be signed, the price he had been required to pay for it, and pay in advance, rested heavily on his mind. Evidently the great council had consented to the sacrifice he had made, as it was before the great council that Margaret had made her promise two days later; and undoubtedly he had a legal right to revoke the two statutes, as he had been careful to reserve that right at the time they were enacted. In all probability, too, he fully believed that Charles intended, or could now easily be persuaded, to revoke his father's edict against English cloth. But at the same time he knew that what he had done would raise a storm of protest in England, and during another council meeting held at Brentford between 15th and 17th October,[2] the decision seems to have been that it would he wiser for him not to face the representatives of his people for the present. For when parliament reassembled at Reading on 6th November, it was immediately prorogued until 5th May.[3] The die was cast, however, and a week later the chancellor received another royal warrant ordering him to draw up letters patent announcing that, at the request of the most illustrious prince, Charles, Duke of Burgundy, the king had granted the duke's subjects permission to bring, sell, and distribute in his kingdom all goods and merchandise which had been "lawful and not prohibited" before 29th April, 1463.[4]

That England's ban on Burgundian products had been lifted was agreeable news for the Netherlands, and especially for the town of Veere, whose ships forthwith began again to carry their miscellaneous cargoes to the ports of Newcastle, Boston, and Ipswich.[5] Nor did Edward himself fail to profit, as a merchant, by what he had done; for his factors were soon busy importing hats, brushes, baskets, pins, fans, spectacles, wainscots, and many other articles, useful or ornamental, from the Netherlands.[1] But when, on 24th November, a new thirty years' treaty of mercantile intercourse between England and Burgundy was signed, it was found that Isabella of Portugal had conceded nothing in the matter of English cloth. The treaty made provision in a general way for the free exchange of all kinds of merchandise between the two countries with the exception of armour, artillery, powder, and other articles of that nature, but the subject of the importation of English cloth into Burgundy, as well as certain staple regulations at Calais and certain ordinances in England which the merchants of Burgundy regarded as prejudicial to them, were expressly reserved for further consideration. Another conference or diet was to be held later, at a time and place to be decided before 15th January, and then the claims of both parties were to be presented in writing.[2] What was more, the marriage treaty itself was left for further consideration; and when Hatclyf returned to England, apparently to carry a copy of the new treaty to Edward, he brought the news that Charles had agreed to a six months' truce with the king of France.[3]

---

[1] Worcester, 788.
[2] Issue Roll, Mich. 7 Edw. IV, 26th Oct.; Privy Seals.
[3] Rolls of Parl., V, 619.
[4] Writs of Privy Seal, file 815, no. 2281. (See Appendix VII).
[5] Customs Accounts.

Charles had agreed to his truce with Louis very reluctantly and ungraciously, but Edward was none the less displeased, and when he heard that Olivier de la Marche, who had just been in England again, had betaken himself to France instead of going straight home,[4] all his old fear of Charles was reawakened. It was even rumoured that Charles had undertaken, with the help of René of Anjou and the Count of Maine, to make peace between Louis and the Duke of Normandy, and that a marriage was being planned between one of Louis' daughters and the son of Henry VI and Margaret of Anjou.[5] Consequently Edward did not ratify

[1] *Ibid.*, London 73/33.

[2] Rymer, XI, 591-600.

[3] Plancher, IV, cclvi; Chastellain, V, 339-346; Chronique Scandaleuse, I, 187, 191; Waurin, II, 356-358, 360-361. According to Chastellain (V, 358), two thousand English mercenaries were at Calais at this time ready to help Charles in his war with Liége but the duke, to please Louis, did not make use of them. This may have helped to make Edward suspicious of Charles. English mercenaries had served Charles in the war with Liége in the preceding year. Commynes, I, 109-111.

[4] La Marche had been sent to England in October and again, with Jean Carondelet, master of requests, and Nicolas Bouesseau, in the latter part of November or beginning of December. La Marche, xlv-xlvi; Stein, 40-42. He had instructions to visit the Dukes of Brittany and Normandy as well as Louis. Stein, pièces justificatives, no. xxii.

[5] See a letter written by Monypenny, Waurin, III, 190.

the treaty which his ambassadors had signed. Instead, he gave a new commission to the Bishop of Salisbury, Hatclyf, and Vaughan to treat further with Charles in regard to a perpetual peace, mercantile intercourse, and the marriage.[1] And while Hatclyf went back to Brussels with this commission, the expected storm of protest against the concessions that were being made to Burgundy broke forth. It was said quite openly in the London taverns, and in other places, also, that the men who had advised the king to refuse an alliance with France for the sake of one with Burgundy deserved to lose their heads.[2]

Perhaps Edward himself was beginning to think that a few heads deserved to fall. But, whatever his thoughts, he did not attempt to retrace his steps. Nor did he humble himself before Warwick by admitting that possibly he had blundered. Far from it! The earl's retirement to Yorkshire had increased his distrust of him and, afraid to attack him directly, he vented his spite on the Archbishop of York again. During the council meeting at Brentford word had come from the Pope that, on 18th September, the cardinal's hat had been bestowed on the Archbishop of Canterbury, and in mockery Edward sent the Pope's letter to George Neville.[3]

The king's sharp-edged jest might better have been foregone, but it had probably been provoked by the discovery that the Nevilles had been seeking at the papal court, not only a cardinal's hat but something more. When giving the Duke of Milan to understand that, with Warwick's help, he had arrived at an understanding with the king of England, Louis had intimated that Warwick's daughter was to marry Edward's brother Clarence; and it would appear that even at that time Warwick was taking steps to obtain from the Pope a dispensation for such a marriage. But though Clarence, who was a weak and ambitious youth and who had probably been offended by the failure of the Duke of Burgundy to welcome him as a husband for his daughter, was more than ready to marry Anne Neville and enjoy possession of a slice of the Neville estates, he, as well as Warwick, was wise enough to know that Edward would never consent to what they were planning; and all that was done at Rome was carefully hidden from the king. In some way, however, perhaps through some chance remark in the Pope's letter concerning the cardinal's hat, Edward got wind of what was going on in time to take preventive measures, and the Pope, being warned, refused to grant the dispensation.[1]

---

[1] French Roll 7 Edw. IV, m. 10; Signed Bills, file 1499, no. 4214; Warrants for Issues, 7 Edw. IV, 13th Dec.

[2] Monypenny's letter, *ut sup.*

[3] Worcester, 789; Vatican Transcripts, 62. The cardinal's hat was not actually delivered to Archbishop Bourchier until 1472.

The anger Edward felt when he discovered that Warwick was trying to make a tool of Clarence was natural enough, and unfortunately it soon found new matter to feed on. For not long after this Lord Herbert, who was again conducting the siege of Harlech Castle, captured a messenger who was carrying letters from Margaret of Anjou to the rebels in the castle, and when this man was sent to the king to be questioned, he accused many persons of treason and even declared that he had heard it said beyond sea that the sympathies of the Earl of Warwick himself were really with Queen Margaret.[2]

The report which was going about in France, and on which the statement of the messenger captured near Harlech was probably based, was that Warwick had retired to Yorkshire for the purpose of raising troops, that the people of Wales had proclaimed Henry VI as king, and that the Earl of Pembroke and other friends of Margaret of Anjou were preparing to go over to Wales and help on the expected insurrection.[3] This sounded like an absurd story. For what benefit could Warwick—and much less Clarence, who now seemed to be involved in all the earl's schemes—possibly expect to derive from the restoration of the house of Lancaster? But by this time Edward was ready to suspect Warwick of anything, and he immediately summoned the earl to come and give an account of himself. This summons Warwick refused to obey. He would not come, he declared, even under the protection of a safeconduct; and in the end Edward had to send the earl's accuser to him. Two prisoners, one of whom was undoubtedly the man Herbert had captured, were conducted to the king's "right entirely beloved cousin of Warwick" at Sheriff Hutton,[4] and when the earl heard that he was accused of favouring Margaret of Anjou, he had no difficulty in proving the foolishness of the story. Yet Edward was not satisfied, and when he provided himself with a bodyguard of a couple of hundred men, no one needed to ask who was suspected of evil intent.[1]

---

[1] Worcester, 788.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 121.

[4] Warrants for Issues, 8 Edw. IV, 2nd July. Worcester's statement that the earl's accuser was taken to him at Middleham seems to be not quite accurate.

So the year 1467 ended in uncertainty about the treaty with Burgundy and in dread of what Warwick's angry silence might portend, and when, about the middle of December, the king and queen, with the Duke of Clarence and many other lords, rode from Windsor to Coventry to keep Christmas, the new bodyguard was conspicuously in attendance. It was not just for a Christmas party, however, that Edward had left Windsor. He was setting out to keep the promise he had made to the House of Commons in the summer that crime should be punished and repressed, and he took Clarence with him, not because he found pleasure in his brother's companionship, but apparently because the duke had been showing a curious amount of interest in a " horrible murder " which had been committed near Derby in November, when Lord Grey of Codnor's men got into a quarrel with the Earl of Shrewsbury's men and killed a man of the name of Vernon.[2]

The state of things Edward found on his way to Coventry was evidently worse than he had anticipated, as so many " great riots and oppressions done unto our subjects " were reported to him that he wrote in haste to the chancellor for commissions of *oyer* and *terminer* for Nottinghamshire, Staffordshire, Shropshire, and Herefordshire and, a week later, for Warwickshire and Worcestershire.[3] But even had he added many more counties, it would not have sufficed, since from end to end of his kingdom some evil influence seemed to be at work. Down in Kent the popular feeling against the Woodvilles found expression in a raid, on the first day of January, on an estate belonging to Earl Rivers, during which trees were cut down, deer killed, and the house itself saved from pillage only by the flight of the servants with the valuables. And up in Yorkshire, about the same time, several hundred men who had been gathering about a captain called Robin secretly offered their services to the Earl of Warwick, who sent them home, however, with a promise to let them know when he wanted their help.[4]

---

[1] Worcester, *ut sup.*

[2] *Ibid.*, 788-789. Probably the man who was killed was a son or a brother of Henry Vernon of Derbyshire to whom we shall find Clarence writing a letter in March, 1471.

[3] Warrants under the Signet, file 1380, 22nd Dec. ; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 55.

[4] Monypenny's letter, Waurin, III, 193-194. Monypenny speaks of the threatened rising in Warwick's favour as occurring in " Surforchier," which

Even over in Ireland, where turbulence was the order of the day, there were more than the wonted disturbances, so that it began to look as if Edward had undone all the good work his father had accomplished there.

The troubles in Ireland had to do with the valiant and learned Earl of Desmond, and they deserve more than a passing mention. After his success in driving the Earl of Ormond out of Ireland in the summer of 1462, Desmond was appointed deputy governor under the Duke of Clarence, and for a time after his appointment all went well. The Anglo-Irish liked him and the native Irish were kept fairly quiet partly by the annual tributes which were being paid to the chiefs of the leading clans and perhaps particularly by the persuasion of Henry O'Neill, the redoubtable head of the O'Neills, with whom Edward was able to make friends and on whom he bestowed, in token of his friendship, a collar of gold, forty yards of scarlet, and some buckram.[1] But unfortunately peace and quiet never lasted long in the land of St. Patrick, and Desmond had not been deputy governor many months before he got into a violent dispute with a former deputy governor, Sherwood, Bishop of Meath, which led both of them to go over to England in the summer of 1464 to "make complaints against one another."[2] At that time the Irish parliament wrote a letter to the king in which Desmond was highly commended for the great services he had rendered in Ireland both to Edward and to Edward's father of blessed memory, for establishing "reasonable peace and tranquility," for defeating two attempts made by the Earl of Ormond to get a foothold in Ireland, and for checking without bloodshed a dangerous rising in Meath;[3] and Edward was so impressed by this letter that he not only allowed Desmond to retain the deputy governorship, but gave him an annuity of a hundred pounds and contributed two bonnets, several pieces of scarlet, and a few other adornments to his wardrobe.[4] Nevertheless, either Sherwood succeeded after a time in poisoning the king's

---

Mlle. Dupont thought meant Suffolkshire, but which Professor Oman is probably correct in interpreting as South Yorkshire.

[1] Gilbert, Viceroys of Ireland, 376; Annals of Ulster (edited by B. MacCarthy, Dublin, 1845), III, 209-210; Annals of the Four Masters, IV, 1027; Enrolments of Wardrobe Accounts (account of George Darell, Mich. 2 Edw. IV—4th April, 5 Edw. IV), roll 6, m. 55.

[2] Annals of the Four Masters, IV, 1035.

[3] Facsimiles of National Manuscripts of Ireland, Part III, no. xlviii.

[4] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 340; Enrolments of Wardrobe Accounts, *ut sup.*; Annals of Ireland (translated by Dudley Firbisse), 256; Gilbert, 380-381.

mind against Desmond, or else Desmond brought trouble on himself, as the story goes, by telling Edward that he ought to divorce Elizabeth Woodville and marry some foreign princess whose connections would help to give strength and stability to his throne ;[1] for when, in May, 1465, the Duke of Clarence was reappointed lieutenant of Ireland, the Earl of Worcester was made deputy governor in Desmond's place.[2] It is said that Worcester's new office was obtained for him by Queen Elizabeth, who hoped through him to revenge herself on Desmond.

Edward's indentures with Worcester were signed at Greenwich on 11th May, and on 5th June the chancellor was told to make ready "writs of passage" for the earl and his retinue and also a commission for one Thomas Grene to take and deliver to the earl "certain stuff of guns and other artillery" lying at Eccleshall and other places in Cheshire.[3] But if Worcester actually went to Ireland in 1465, he did not stay there long, as in the summer of 1466 Desmond was again serving as Clarence's deputy and conducting vigorous campaigns against the Irish. In the course of these he fell into the hands of O'Connor Faly, his brother-in-law, and was held a prisoner until the English of Dublin came and rescued him.[4] In the following spring Clarence undertook to provide for the safety of Ireland for seven years with the help of seven hundred archers who were to be ready for him by 24th May, and again Worcester was to replace Desmond.[5] But though Worcester began at once to make arrangements for the transportation of the seven hundred archers to Ireland, for some reason they were not ready on 24th May or for several months after. It was not until August that they were assembled at Beaumaris, and not until September that Worcester, after resigning the constableship of England to Earl Rivers, set sail with them.[6]

Almost immediately after reaching Ireland, Worcester summoned a parliament, and he evidently succeeded in excluding Desmond's friends from it, as the body which four years before had paid so

---

Two payments of £200 each made to Desmond are recorded on Tellers' Roll, Easter 5 Edw. IV. They probably represent two instalments of his annuity.

[1] Gilbert, 386-387.

[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 294, 437 ; Warrants for Issues, 5 Edw. IV, 18th May.

[3] Warrants for Issues, *ut sup.;* Warrants under the Signet, file 1378, 5th June, 1465. Cf. Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 488.

[4] Annals of the Four Masters, IV, 1041-1043.

[5] Exchequer Accounts, bundle 71/5, no. 948 (Clarence's indenture with the king) ; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 28, 29.

[6] Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 19, 54 ; Worcester, 788.

warm a tribute to Desmond's loyalty and valour now proceeded to attaint both Desmond and his brother-in-law, the Earl of Kildare, on an obviously trumped-up charge of helping the Irish. Kildare's father-in-law, Roland Fitz-Eustace, Baron of Portlester, was even accused of having incited Desmond to make himself king of Ireland, and he escaped attainder only because his accuser fled without trying to prove his charges. Nor was Worcester satisfied with the attainder of Desmond, a man who seems to have been almost his equal in learning and culture and much his superior in the best qualities of manhood; for when the earl bravely came to face his enemies and offer proof of his innocence, he was seized and beheaded at Drogheda on 14th February, 1468, and his two young sons were treated with great cruelty, if not put to death.[1]

According to the story, in all that he did in Ireland Worcester was acting for Elizabeth Woodville, who purloined the king's signet ring and signed Desmond's death warrant with it. And certain it is that Edward was far from pleased when he heard of the slaying of the man whom the Irish annalist describes as "the most illustrious of his tribe in Ireland in his time for his comeliness and stature, for his hospitality and chivalry, his charity and humanity to the poor and indigent of the Lord, his bounteousness in bestowing jewels and riches on the laity, the clergy, and the poets, and his suppression of theft and immorality."[2] However, the king's displeasure was not so great that it led him to recall Worcester from Ireland or to omit to send a large cup of silver and gilt as a baptismal present when a son was born to the earl in Ireland and was given the name of Edward.[3]

Not long after Desmond's death Worcester succeeded in laying hands on Kildare also and in imprisoning him at Dublin. But if he thought to deal with Kildare as he had dealt with Desmond, he was deprived of the opportunity, as Gerald of Desmond, a son of the murdered earl,[4] allying himself with Tayge O'Connor, rose in revolt to avenge his father's death. While Gerald ravaged the county of Meath, whose bishop was believed to have had a hand in Worcester's cruel deed, Roland Fitz-Eustace rescued Kildare from his prison and carried him off to join the rebels. Worcester went in pursuit, as his friends in the Irish parliament told King Edward in a long letter which they wrote on 28th June, 1468, but when he reached Trim, the rebels withdrew to a place in the county of Meath called the ford of Athgane, and when Tayge O'Connor and some of his men were surrounded and in danger of capture, they were "favourably rescued" by Kildare and Fitz-Eustace. Afterwards, according to the same letter, Worcester succeeded in putting Gerald of Desmond "to rebuke," and then Kildare and Fitz-Eustace submitted. But even after the submission of Kildare and Fitz-Eustace peace did not reign, as in the meantime war had broken out in the north between James Savage, seneschal of the county of Ulster, and Con O'Neill, the "mighty captain of the north."[1] Savage gathered together a "great multitude of people" in the county of Lecale and rode into "Con's country," but Con, after pretending to offer peace, fell upon him and slew him with five hundred of his men.[2]

---

[1] Gilbert, 385-388; Annals of Ross, 46; Annals of Ulster, 219-221.

[2] Worcester, 789; Annals of the Four Masters, IV, 1051-1053.

[3] Issue Roll, Easter 9 Edw. IV, 8th May. This son became Earl of Worcester after his father's death and died in August, 1485. Dugdale, II, 41.

[4] Gilbert calls Gerald a "kinsman" of Desmond, but according to the Annals of the Four Masters, IV, 1057, he was the earl's son.

Although Worcester's friends tried, when writing to the king, to put everything in the best possible light and urged that money and reinforcements should be sent to him, it was evident that, far from frightening Ireland into peace and tranquility, the earl was stirring up a serious rebellion. Fortunately Edward realized in time that a mistake had been made and that the mistake consisted in thinking that Ireland could be held without the help, and despite the enmity, of the Geraldines. Before the year 1468 came to a close he summoned the hated "Saxon earl" to England, and Kildare was made deputy governor after he had promised to use his influence to restore peace.[3]

---

[1] Cf. Annals of the Four Masters, *ut sup.*

[2] Ancient Correspondence, Vol. LVIII, no. 50. This letter has recently been published by Miss Thornley in "England under the Yorkists" (London, 1920), 256.

[3] Gilbert, 391.

CHAPTER V

THE MARRIAGE OF MARGARET OF YORK AND CHARLES THE BOLD

THE first thought which came into the mind of the king of France when his ambassadors returned from England with nothing but a promise of an embassy from Edward and a few paltry gifts was that Warwick had been deceiving him; and he complained bitterly because the earl had fulfilled none of the numerous promises he had made.[1] Louis began to awaken to the truth, however, when he heard how the earl had withdrawn to Yorkshire and that it was suspected he was on the eve of starting a rebellion. He began to realize that he had misunderstood the situation across the sea, that Edward was not the nonentity he had taken him to be, and that Warwick's influence, however powerful it had been in the start, was no longer the determining force in England. It was with evident fear and misgivings that Edward had asserted his own will in his matrimonial affairs, but time had changed all that. Now he accepted dictation from no one, and if he had resolved not to enter into an alliance with France, not even Warwick could alter his decision. Nevertheless, Louis saw no chance of getting what he wanted except by Warwick's help, and the knowledge that the earl had quarrelled with Edward did not make him less anxious to preserve his influence over him. Whatever the future might bring forth—and especially if it brought forth civil war in England once more—Warwick's friendship would be of value, and Louis lost no opportunity to keep in touch with the earl..

During the autumn of 1467 Warwick's kinsman, Robert Neville, had been in France again, and when he started for home about Christmas time, Louis sent William Monypenny in his company to carry some letters and messages to the angry earl in Yorkshire. During the time he was in England with Louis' ambassadors, Monypenny had succeeded in insinuating himself so far into

---

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 121.

Edward's good graces that he had been given, in addition to a gift of twenty-five marks in money, a year's safeconduct for himself, his wife, children, and servants, and a ship of Dieppe;[1] and it was probably under the protection of this safeconduct that he now ventured to return to England. As he pretended to be on his way to Scotland again, he embarked, with Robert Neville, for some port far up on the eastern coast of England and planned to make his meeting with Warwick look like a chance incident of his journey to his native land. But the boat in which he took passage was forced by contrary winds to put in at Sandwich, and this involuntary change of route proved a blessing in disguise, as he found two of Warwick's friends, Lord Wenlock and Thomas Kent, in London and got from them some valuable information about the state of English affairs. For one thing, these two gentlemen told Monypenny and Neville of the rumours in circulation concerning the Duke of Burgundy's negotiations with the king of France. In fact, the first question Wenlock and Kent put to Monypenny was whether it was true that the Burgundian ambassadors had gone to meet the French king. And when he assured them that, with his own eyes, he had seen Olivier de la Marche and other councillors of the Duke of Burgundy at Honfleur, they did not hesitate to say that this was the best piece of news he could possibly bring to the Earl of Warwick.

From London Monypenny proceeded to Coventry to find the king, as this was what Wenlock and Kent advised him to do; and immediately upon his arrival in Coventry, Edward sent for him and asked him for news of the king of France and whether he had brought him any letters. Monypenny seized the chance to give a glowing account of Louis' affairs, dwelling particularly on the number of lords and men-at-arms Louis had gathered about him, and he explained Louis' failure to send any letters by his hand by saying that he had not come to England as a messenger of the French king, but was merely travelling to Scotland to look after his own personal interests. Edward was a little sceptical about the truth of this story and demanded to know whether Monypenny had any letters for the Earl of Warwick. Cornered by this point blank question, Monypenny admitted that he did have some letters for Warwick, but he denied any knowledge of their contents and merely said he thought they expressed the king of France's astonishment that no embassy had been sent to him in spite of the promise the king of England had given. At that Edward declared very emphatically that he would take Warwick's advice and would send an embassy soon; and he also swore by his favourite oath, "by the mercy of God," that he would uphold the French king against his brother, the Duke of Normandy, who, he said, was a fool through whom the lords of France were hoping to run the kingdom to suit themselves.

---

[1] Writs of Privy Seal, file 813, nos. 2178 and 2179; Issue Roll, Mich. 7 Edw. IV, 9th Nov. A similar safeconduct was granted to Monypenny in the following year. Cal. Documents relating to Scotland, IV, 280.

As Edward was so emphatic, Monypenny jumped to the conclusion that, although the Duke of Burgundy had just sent one of his secretaries to England to say that he would give his final answer about his marriage with the Lady Margaret before the end of January, if the embassy which had gone to Rome to ask for the dispensation returned within that time, the king of England did not put much faith in Charles's promises; and in a letter which he wrote to Louis on 16th January—the source from which all these facts about his journey are derived—he advised that an effort should be made to persuade the Pope not to grant the dispensation immediately. Louis was told that the truce Charles had signed with him and the embassy he had sent to him had already excited so much suspicion in England that, if the marriage were postponed again, even those who till now had been friendly to the Duke of Burgundy would become convinced that he had been dissembling all the time. There was not a woman or child in England, Monypenny declared, who would not rise up against Charles if the marriage failed now.[1]

But the Seigneur de Concressault was not quite as wise as he thought he was; for on 5th January, almost under his nose, Edward had ratified the new mercantile treaty with Burgundy, had proposed that the diet for the settlement of the important problems which had been left for further consideration when the treaty was signed should meet at Bruges on 20th March, and had sent still another commission to the Bishop of Salisbury, Hatclyf, and Vaughan to treat for the marriage of Margaret and Charles.[2] Moreover, when Monypenny left Coventry and betook himself to Yorkshire to see Warwick, the first piece of news the earl gave him was that Edward was still intriguing with the Duke of Brittany; and in proof of this, the earl produced a copy of some letters which told that Francis had just offered to hand over to Edward some fourteen or fifteen places in Normandy in exchange for the services of three thousand archers.

---

[1] Waurin, III, 186-196.
[2] Rymer, XI, 591-601.

Warwick was right when he said that negotiations were still going on between Edward and the Duke of Brittany. But it was four thousand archers instead of three thousand that Francis had recently sent Jean de Rouville and Olivier de Breuil, seneschal of Rennes, to ask for, and it was the duke's hope that Edward could be persuaded to furnish these troops for six months' service and entirely at his own expense.[1] This was a good deal more than Edward was willing to promise on the instant, but he was ready to do something for Francis. The day after Christmas he empowered the Prior of St. John's, Thomas Kent, of whose devotion to Warwick he seems to have been unaware, and Henry Sharp to treat for an extension of his truce with Brittany until 1st July, and three days before Monypenny's letter to Louis was written this agreement was signed and orders were given for its proclamation. At the same time the sheriffs of the coast counties were reminded that the truce with France would expire on 1st March and were commanded to see that the watches were set in the accustomed places and the beacons kept in good order.[2]

Another piece of information which Monypenny gave Louis was that, on 7th January, Warwick had received a summons from the king and that he had refused to obey it. After taking counsel with his friends, the earl had replied "tout court," Monypenny said, that he would not go to the king as long as Rivers, Herbert, and Scales were with him; and at the moment Monypenny wrote his letter the earl was on the point of going to the Scottish border to meet the Earl of Northumberland. But though Monypenny declared that if King Edward ventured to come farther north, Warwick would defend himself, the words were scarcely written when the earl was persuaded by the Archbishop of York, who, by the management of some friends of both parties, had had a meeting with Rivers at Nottingham, to go to Coventry to attend a council meeting.[3]

The council met before the end of January, and Edward, who himself was almost incapable of cherishing anger long, took it for granted that Warwick, as he had consented to come to Coventry, must have recovered his senses and his temper. He received the earl very cordially, therefore, and the Archbishop of York was rewarded for his mediatory services with the restoration of some lands that had been taken from him by the last act of resumption.[1] But unfortunately it soon became evident that Warwick had not come to Coventry in the spirit Edward supposed. Although the earl condescended to meet and be reconciled with Herbert and two other favourites of the king, Stafford and Audley,[2] either he continued to refuse to have anything to do with Rivers and Scales or it was felt wise to keep them out of sight; and when the subject of the Burgundian marriage was brought up, his opposition was found to be not a whit less violent than before.

---

[1] Morice, III, 169-171. Edward presented Olivier du Breuil with a gold cup. Issue Roll, Easter 8 Edw. IV, 1st June.

[2] French Roll 7 Edw. IV, m. 9 and 10; Signed Bills, file 1499, no. 4216; Warrants under the Signet, file 1380, 13th Jan.; Rymer, XI, 602-605.

[3] Worcester, 789.

According to what Monypenny wrote in a later letter to Louis, Edward made two requests of Warwick—requests which, if actually made, show how utterly the king misunderstood the disposition of the man with whom he was dealing. For in the first place, according to Monypenny, the king asked Warwick to give the Duke of Burgundy his note for one hundred thousand marks—probably the price Charles had put on his hand; and in the second place he requested the earl to lend some help towards sending the Duke of Brittany the four thousand archers he wanted.

Of course Warwick refused to do what the king asked. More than that, he did his utmost to make the king see the folly of the course he was pursuing, warning him that the fine promises the Dukes of Burgundy and Brittany seemed so willing to make were dictated by no love which they felt for him, but simply by their fear of the king of France. Edward would not listen, however, and the most he could be brought to concede was that there should be another council meeting at London, a month later, to which Warwick should have the privilege of inviting such persons as he wished.[3] It was ominous, too, that Warwick felt called upon to send a report to his friend, the king of France. "In England the country is in arms," wrote the Milanese ambassador in France on 14th February. "The Earl of Warwick has drawn over a brother of the king against the king himself. They have not yet come to open hostilities, but are treating for an accommodation. The Earl of Warwick has sent word here."[1]

---

[1] See Worcester and another letter which Monypenny wrote to Louis on 8th March. Morice, III, 159-161.

[2] Worcester.

[3] Monypenny's letter of 8th March.

When the second council meeting began, on 27th February, the only persons present were Warwick, Stillington, the chancellor, Essex, Rivers, whom Warwick had evidently found it impossible to ignore, the Prior of St. John's, Sir John Say, Sir John Howard, Thomas Kent, John Grene, and William Notyngham;[2] and on 8th March Monypenny, who by this time had returned to London with Robert Neville and was on his way back to France, wrote a very hopeful letter to Louis, saying that he looked for the fulfilment "d'un grant party de vos désirs." Louis was assured that no man had ever loved him more faithfully than Warwick loved him, and that apparently England had never loved Warwick so well as she loved him at this day; for as the earl passed through the country on his way to London, Monypenny wrote, the people had cried as if with one voice, "Warwick! Warwick!" and had behaved as if God himself had descended from the skies. Monypenny also stated that Warwick was going to send him to France in about ten days, with Neville and some members of Edward's council; and although he was unable to report that the council had arrived at any definite decision as yet, he again expressed to Louis his belief that, "à l'aide de Dieu, par amour ou par autre chemin, un grant party de vos désirs seront accomplis." However, he added that if Louis could send the right kind of news about Spain, it would be of help, as the report was that Henry the Impotent's rebellious brother had gained the ascendancy in Castile and this made the English fear that they were going to lose the friendship of that kingdom in spite of the treaty so recently signed.

Monypenny's letter contained some other items of news not altogether pleasing. One was that it was being said that in two or three weeks about a thousand Englishmen were going to be sent to sea to protect the merchants of England against the French. Another was that the Duke of Brittany had just sent the seneschal of Rennes to England again, with a retainer of the Bastard of Brittany, and that this time Francis had promised to deliver to

---

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 122.

[2] See an endorsement on Signed Bills, file 1499, no. 4220, 16th Feb. Grene had been Speaker of the Commons in the last parliament of Henry VI. Notyngham had been king's attorney to Henry and had been reappointed to that office by Edward in 1461. In 1469 he was made chief baron of the Exchequer. Foss, Judges of England; Cal. Patent Rolls, I, 1; III, 154.

Edward all the places the Bretons had occupied in Normandy as soon as the English archers he had asked for were ready to sail. As far as Francis was concerned, however, Monypenny thought there was no real occasion to worry, as he flattered himself that he had checkmated the duke. Being in close touch with Scotland, he had found out that Francis and the Duke of Normandy were seeking aid there as well as in England, and that they had sent an embassy to King James to ask for ten thousand men to help the Duke of Normandy to get possession of his duchy and to offer a marriage between the duke and James's second sister;[1] and on making this discovery, he had not only written to his friends in Scotland, telling them not to trust what the Breton ambassadors said, but had hastened to inform the king of England's councillors of what was going on. He pointed out to Edward's advisers that Francis must be playing false either with the king of England or with Louis' brother, as he was promising the duchy of Normandy to both of them; and his revelations had so much effect that he felt he could bid Louis be of good cheer as far as the Duke of Brittany was concerned.

Yet Monypenny's bright hopes took a tumble a few days after his letter was written. For on 13th March Edward came up to London,[2] and then it was learned that the Burgundian marriage treaty had been signed at Brussels on 16th February and that, immediately afterwards, Charles had ratified the mercantile treaty, had agreed that the diet for the discussion of the matters still in dispute should meet at Bruges on 20th March, as Edward had suggested, and had given a promise to support the king of England against all his enemies.[3] By the terms of the marriage treaty, ratifications of which were to be exchanged before 24th March, Charles was to obtain the dispensation from the Pope at his own expense and Edward was to pay Charles two hundred thousand gold crowns of France (£41,666 13*s.* 4*d*)[4]—fifty thousand crowns the day the marriage was solemnized and the same amount each year for three years. All these payments were to be made at Bruges, and Edward was to deposit the first fifty thousand crowns with the merchants there fifteen days before the marriage, which, according to an agreement made either at the time the treaty was signed or very shortly after, was to take place on 4th May.[1] Edward also had to send his future brother-in-law a bond, binding upon his heirs and successors as well as upon himself, and this bond must be placed in the hands of Thomas Portinari, governor of the society of Piero de Medici at Bruges,[2] one month before Margaret went to Burgundy. If the bond was found to be satisfactory in all respects, Portinari was to deliver it to Charles, but if it was found to be unsatisfactory, the king must either provide another or consign to Portinari's care goods which would serve as ample security. Nor was Edward left to suppose that his own signature would be accepted as sufficient guarantee. He must induce the merchants of the staple, the English merchants residing at Bruges and other places in Burgundy, or the Italian merchants, or all of them together, to go security for him for the payment of the one hundred and fifty thousand crowns due after the marriage should have taken place. He had to promise, too, the continuance of Margaret's collateral rights of inheritance in England and elsewhere, to furnish her with household utensils, clothing, and jewels befitting her high station, and to defray the expenses of her journey to Bruges; while Charles promised that, in case Margaret survived him and the entire two hundred thousand gold crowns had been paid, she should enjoy for the rest of her life an annual income of sixteen thousand gold crowns derived from the revenues of Mechlin, Dendermonde, and Oudenarde. On the other hand, if any part of the two hundred thousand crowns remained unpaid when Margaret became a widow, and continued to be unpaid, her income was to be reduced in proportion, while if she died before her husband and before all of the two hundred thousand gold crowns had been paid, Charles might demand the rest of the money if any children, male or female, had been born of the marriage. If there were no children, Edward would have to pay only so much of the two hundred thousand gold crowns as had been due at the time of his sister's death.[3]

---

[1] What Monypenny actually says is that they offered the marriage to the second daughter of the king of Scotland, "car l'aisnée est mariée à un comte du pays." But by the king of Scotland he means James II, not James III, who was not yet married. The older sister of James III had married the Earl of Arran about a year before this. Hume Brown, Hist. of Scot., I, 259.

[2] Privy Seals.

[3] Rymer, XI, 605-615; Palgrave, Kal. of the Exchequer, III, 9-10.

[4] At the monetary conference held at Bruges in the following year the value of the French crown was determined to be 4*s.* 2*d.* English money. A. de Witte, Conférence monétaire internationale tenue à Bruges en 1469.

---

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 123.

[2] Portinari was also a member of Charles's council. La Marche, III, 113.

[3] There is a copy of the marriage treaty in Warrants under the Signet, file

Such a marriage treaty as this might well have made Edward hesitate, especially as his subjects had already shown how they felt towards Burgundy and as Warwick's opposition was so determined. But he had come to London with his mind fully made up, and the day after he arrived he ratified the treaty and also gave his promise to support Charles against all his enemies, as the duke had already promised to support him against all his enemies.[1] Monypenny's hopes even about the Duke of Brittany were dashed; for on the 18th Edward directed the chancellor to draw up letters patent of a treaty of amity and mutual defence with Brittany which was identical in form with the treaty signed with Burgundy and which Francis had already accepted (1st February).[2] This was followed up, on 3rd April, with an offer to Jean de Rouville and Olivier du Breuil to send three thousand English archers to Cancale within two months after Francis called for them and to pay one half of their wages for six months. Edward demanded, however, that Francis should pay the other half of the wages before the archers left England and, in addition, exacted from the duke a promise which reveals clearly the trend his thoughts had been taking while Warwick was trying to draw him into an alliance with France. For Francis had to promise that if, during the time the English archers were in his service, he acquired, either by conquest or by treaty, any towns or lands of the crown desmesne of France, and the king of England or his lieutenant crossed the sea with an army to conquer France, he would deliver such towns or lands to the king of England upon payment of suitable compensation for his expenses in taking them, and that if he acquired any other towns or lands which, although not of the crown desmesne, were subject to the crown of France, he would hold them of the king of England in the same manner in which they had been held of the king of France before their capture.[3]

On 11th April Edward gave orders for the preparation of the bond he had to send to the Duke of Burgundy, and about the same time twenty pounds were expended on a diamond ring which was

---

1380. See also a printed copy in Dumont, Corps universel diplomatique du droit des gens (The Hague, 1726), III, pt. I, 372-375.

[1] Warrants under the Signet, *ut sup*.

[2] Warrants under the signet, file 1381, 18th March; Rymer, XI, 603, 615; Palgrave, Kal. of the Exchequer, III, 10. See also Dupuy, Réunion de la Bretagne à la France, I, 199.

[3] Morice, III, 169-171.

sent to Charles in the Lady Margaret's name.[1] At this point, however, there came a slight hitch. When Charles received the marriage dispensation from Italy, he sent it to Edward by the hands of a papal legate—probably the man who had brought it from Rome; and though at first this legate seemed to be satisfied with the document, afterwards, very likely on a hint from the Archbishop of York, he expressed doubt as to whether it was drawn up in the proper form. This caused Edward to take alarm, and he asked Charles to postpone the marriage until 8th June.[2] The dispensation had already cost Charles much trouble and expense,[3] as Louis, acting on Monypenny's advice, had been doing his utmost to persuade the Pope to refuse it, but he consented to the postponement of the marriage and, while further word from Rome was awaited, forged another bond with his brother-in-law to-be by making him a knight of the Golden Fleece.[4]

Monypenny may not have found out all that passed between Edward on the one hand and Charles and Francis on the other, but he must have learned enough to make him much less sanguine about the gratification of Louis' wishes, and though he parted with Edward on such good terms that the king gave him twenty pounds for his expenses, on his way to France he was captured by the Bretons and held for ransom.[5] Nor did Louis ever receive the good news and the embassy Warwick had hoped to send to him. On the contrary, Edward did not so much as express a desire to renew his truce with France, but sent out a fleet, as Monypenny had heard he meant to do, to wreak vengeance on any Frenchmen who had the temerity to sail the seas.[6] At this Louis grew so uneasy that he summoned the Estates General and secured from them a decision that the duchy of Normandy could not be separated from the crown of France and that the Duke of Brittany must surrender the places in Normandy which he had seized. He also induced Charles to extend his truce with him until 15th July[1] and, without doubt, managed to hear frequently from Warwick, who had not retired to Yorkshire again after the council meetings, but had remained near the king watching the progress of events and biding his time.

---

[1] Signed Bills, file 1499, no. 4227; Issue Roll, Easter 8 Edw. IV, 1st June. See also the bond as entered on French Roll 8 Edw. IV, m. 35.

[2] See a letter written at Bruges on 18th April. Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 122-123. On that day Edward sent word to Sir John Paston to be ready by the first day of June to accompany Margaret to Flanders. Paston Letters, IV, 296-297.

[3] See Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 123, and Trinchera, Codice Aragonese (Naples, 1866-1868), I, no. 342.

[4] 14th May. Reiffenberg, Hist. de l'Ordre de la Toison d'Or, 55-56; Commynes-Lenglet, II, 191; III, 101-103. Some scruples were expressed about bestowing this honour on Edward because the kings of England were the ancient enemies of France, of which kingdom the Duke of Burgundy, the head of the Order of the Golden Fleece, was a peer; but policy easily carried the day. To Thomas Vaughan was intrusted the task of communicating the ordinances and statutes of the Order to Edward.

[5] Issue Roll, Easter 8 Edw. IV, 25th June; Legrand's history, MS. français 6961, f. 367; Commynes-Lenglet, III, 138.

[6] William Wade, Edmund Weston, Thomas Fulthorp, and Richard Harleston

But if Louis and Warwick felt downcast, Edward was having difficulties, too, as he found it no easy matter to raise the money he must pay to Charles. Parliament was to reassemble on 5th May, and both convocations had been called to meet a week later ;[2] but neither from parliament nor from convocation could the king ask for money to be sent to Burgundy, and when he turned for help to the merchants of the staple and to "divers bishops, abbots, priors, and other spiritual persons,"[3] the spiritual persons sent in their loans but slowly, while the merchants of the staple either hesitated to grant what was asked of them or had to be allowed time to see what they could do. Consequently, although the trouble about the dispensation had apparently been adjusted by this time, the marriage had to be delayed again, first until 24th June and afterwards until 3rd July, and the king of France began to bask in the hope that it would never take place at all.[4]

Edward was at Reading on 5th May to open parliament, but he was not quite ready to disclose his plans, and with the excuse that some transactions with certain persons beyond sea which would be made known to the Lords and Commons in due time were not yet completed, an adjournment until 12th May, at Westminster, was announced.[5] What the king was waiting for was the return of Jean de Rouville and Olivier du Breuil, who had hastened home to tell the Duke of Brittany about his offer regarding the archers.

---

were the captains of the fleet, and they took with them a force of five hundred men. Warrants for Issues, 8 Edw. IV, 2nd April.

[1] Chronique Scandaleuse, I, 199-200 ; Plancher, IV, cclvii-cclviii. A promise to pay his brother four thousand francs a month until the question of his appanage was settled was the price Louis paid for the extension of the truce.

[2] Writs of Privy Seal, file 817, no. 2374 ; Wake 378.

[3] Warrants for Issues, 8 Edw. IV, June (day of month illegible). Most of the loans did not come in until July. Receipt Roll, Easter 8 Edw. IV.

[4] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 123.

[5] Rolls of Parl., V, 619.

The two envoys arrived in a few days, and they brought with them a highly satisfactory reply from Francis. Not only was the duke ready to agree to the conditions of the offer made to him, but he had confirmed his treaty of amity and mutual defence with Edward and had proposed a new treaty providing for a truce and intercourse of merchandise between England and Brittany for thirty years.[1] He must have intimated, also, that the Duke of Normandy too would like to arrive at an understanding with the king of England, for on 20th May Edward granted a safeconduct for two of the confidants of Charles of France, the Bishop of Verdun and the Seigneur de Malicorne.[2]

Having added this treaty with the Duke of Brittany to his treaty with the Duke of Burgundy, Edward felt that the stage was conveniently set for his purpose, and when parliament reconvened, more persons than the Earl of Warwick were probably startled by the revelation of the king's intentions. It had always been Edward's aim, the chancellor declared in his address, to "minister law and justice" and to secure peace for his people at home and abroad, and although, as all men knew, at the time he ascended the throne the peace was not kept, the laws were not properly administered, the crown of France and the duchies of Normandy, Gascony, and Guienne were lost, and England was surrounded by enemies on every side, since his accession he had not only restored peace at home, but he had signed treaties of peace and intercourse of merchandise with the kings of Spain, Denmark, and Naples, had concluded an amity and intercourse of merchandise with his "old friends of Almain"[3] and a peace with Scotland "for fifty winters." The only reason a league and intercourse of merchandise with the king of Aragon had not been signed as well was that the Aragonese ambassadors lacked sufficient authority. Lastly, the king had secured an "amity and confederation" with the two "mightiest princes that holden of the crown of France," the Duke of Burgundy, who was to wed his sister, the Lady Margaret, and the Duke of Brittany. And as in seeking all these treaties, the chancellor said, the king had always had the same object in view, namely, to lessen the power of the French king, he now meant, with God's help, to cross the sea to France and overthrow his "great rebel and adversary, Louis, usurpant king of the same." Both the Duke of Burgundy, "one of the most mightiest princes of the world that beareth no crown," and the Duke of Brittany were daily calling upon him to do this, promising that they would help him "in their own persons" and at their own expense and declaring that, in their opinion, not one of the king's progenitors had ever had such a "convenient season" for the recovery of his rights in France. Nor would it be safe, the chancellor warned his hearers, for the king to refuse to avail himself of this chance to recover England's lost possessions; for if he did, the princes who were now offering him their help would have to make other provision for their safety, as they "be mortal and have no issue male." Furthermore, it was much better that the French king should be kept busy at home than that he should be suffered "to enter this land and occupy us here; for doubtless and the king go not thither, his said adversary would come hither."[1]

---

[1] Rymer, XI, 626; Diplomatic Documents (Exchequer, Treasury of Receipt), nos. 523, 532, 533—the original documents with Francis's seal attached; Palgrave, Kal. of the Exchequer, III, 10-11; Dupuy, I, 200. Francis's new commission to his ambassadors, to whom was now joined the Abbot of Bégard, was given at Nantes on 8th May. Morice, III, 169.

[2] Writs of Privy Seal, file 818, no. 2427, 20th May; French Roll 8 Edw. IV, m. 29, 24th May. The Bishop of Verdun was the Duke of Normandy's chancellor at this time, while Jean Aubin, Seigneur de Malicorne, was his chamberlain. Both afterwards entered Louis' service, and the Bishop of Verdun was arrested in 1469 along with his friend, the infamous Cardinal Balue. Commynes-Lenglet, II, 634; Waurin, III, 396, note 5.

[3] This seems to be better than the truth, as the Hamburg diet had been a failure and Edward's relations with the Hanse towns were growing very uncomfortable.

It was the old cry to arms against the French, and the ready response the cry met with shows how much better Edward understood his people than Warwick did. The memory of the glorious battles of Crecy, Poitiers, and Agincourt was still just as fresh as in the days when the Duke of York had filled his manifestoes with invectives against the ministers of Henry VI who had allowed the fruits of those victories to be lost, and no sooner had Edward told the Lords with his own lips that, if granted the necessary money, he would lead an army into France in the coming year than the Commons hastened to grant him two fifteenths and tenths "for the defence of this your realm."[2] Both convocations also granted a tenth, and the convocation of Canterbury added a subsidy of 6*s.* 8*d.* to be levied on all stipendary priests receiving more than one hundred shillings a year.[3]

[1] Rolls of Parl., V, 622-623.
[2] *Ibid.*, V, 623-624; Worcester, 789.
[3] Fine Roll 8 Edw. IV, m. 16-17. Cf. Wilkins, III, 606, and Wake, 378,

As Edward had obtained what he wanted so easily, parliament was dissolved on 7th June, and Speaker Say got two hundred pounds "in recompense of his costs, charges, and expenses."[1] Two days later the thirty years' treaty with Brittany was published, and on the 17th Francis sent authority to Jean de Rouville to make all necessary arrangements with Lord Scales and such other captains as the king of England might choose to send to Brittany with the promised archers.[2]

Yet Edward's troubles were not entirely over even now. Even if he let himself forget the effect the chancellor's speech was likely to have on Warwick, or thought that time would cure the earl's displeasure, he had not forgotten that he had to pay the Duke of Burgundy fifty thousand crowns within a few days. On 28th May the merchants of the staple had consented to loan him ten thousand pounds towards the marriage money,[3] and they were afterwards persuaded to increase this amount by three thousand pounds. But when they granted the additional three thousand pounds, they demanded as security a bond signed by twenty-four mercers, drapers, goldsmiths, fishmongers, and other London merchants, and though the Commons undoubtedly had made their grant to the king for a specific purpose, namely, the waging of war on France, these twenty-four mercers, drapers, goldsmiths, etc., were "saved harmless" by assignments on the third part of the fifteenths and tenths. Nor was this the only inroad the king was driven to make on the Commons' grant in order to raise the marriage money. It was on receipt of assignments on the first part of the fifteenths and tenths that sixty-two wealthy Londoners, including Thomas Olgrave, the mayor, Humphrey Hayford and Thomas Stalbrook, the sheriffs, Hugh Bryce, keeper of the exchange and one of the governors of the mint at the Tower,[4] and Sir Thomas Cook, the draper and former mayor of London who had made loans to Edward on more than one occasion, united in giving a bond for ten thousand pounds to Thomas Portinari, Angelo Tany, Gerard Caniziani, and

---

neither of whom, however, mentions the grant made by the convocation of York.

[1] Worcester, *ut sup.*; Warrants for Issues, 8 Edw. IV, 25th July.

[2] French Roll 8 Edw. IV, m. 33 and 34 (by an obvious slip of the pen the entry is dated 1467); Legrand collections, MS. français 6975, f. 80.

[3] They were to recover their money by shipping wools and woolfells after 6th October, 1474 (the date at which the assignment of the wool duties made to them in 1466 would expire) without paying customs and subsidies. Signed Bills, file 1499, no. 4235; Rolls of Parl., V, 628-629.

[4] See Rolls of Parl., V, 634.

2 G

Lorenzo Bardoce,[1] the four Florentine merchants who were acting as the Duke of Burgundy's attorneys and into whose hands the ten thousand pounds which had been obtained from the merchants of the staple on 28th May were ultimately paid.[2]

Such were the means by which Edward met his obligations to the Duke of Burgundy. But scarcely had he completed these arrangements when, as suddenly as if a bombshell had burst, two of the men who had signed the bond given to Charles's attorneys were carried off to prison.

One Hugh Mille, heir of Sir William Mille, a knight who had died soon after the battle of Towton, probably of wounds received in the battle, and had been attainted by Edward's first parliament,[3] was already in the Fleet on suspicion of treason, and within a week after the dissolution of parliament a man named Cornelius, a servant of one of Margaret of Anjou's companions in exile, Sir Robert Whitingham, was taken at Queenborough. Cornelius had with him a pocketful of letters which some of the Lancastrian exiles had written to friends in England, and among these letters was one from Whitingham himself to one Thomas Danvers. Danvers tried to find shelter in the Temple, but he was captured a day or two later by the queen's brother, Sir Richard Woodville, sent to the king, and then committed to the Tower; and to the Tower Hugh Mille also was transferred for safer keeping. After this Cornelius was put to the torture, and while the hot irons burned his feet, he accused many persons of treasonable intercourse with Queen Margaret. He mentioned even such persons as the London sheriff, Humphrey Hayford, and Sir John Plummer, a London alderman and member of the grocers' company, as well as Sir Gervase Clifton, who had long since been pardoned for adhering to Henry VI, Nicholas Huse, victualler of Calais and lieutenant of Guines in Henry's reign, Peter Alfray, a London draper, and John Hawkins, a servant of Lord Wenlock. Hawkins was then arrested, and when he was questioned, he accused Sir Thomas Cook of complicity in the crime for which Hugh Mille had been imprisoned. He went even farther, for he threw out insinuations against his own master, Lord Wenlock.

---

[1] Or Bardewici.

[2] Warrants for Issues, 8 Edw. IV, June (day of the month illegible); Receipt Roll, Easter 8 Edw. IV; Issue Roll, Easter 8 Edw. IV, 5th, 11th, and 14th July. Cf. Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 270.

[3] Inquisitions *post mortem*, 2 Edw. IV, no. 22; Rolls of Parl., V, 477.

As he listened to the tales of Cornelius and Hawkins, Edward must have wondered if the days of 1462 had come back again. But he did not venture to call Lord Wenlock to account, even if he remembered with some uneasiness that nobleman's former close association with Queen Margaret; and if he felt any misgivings about Warwick, he kept them to himself. Many persons were arrested, however, both in London and elsewhere, and among them was Sir Thomas Cook. Cook had every reason to look for mercy, even generosity, and yet it was only through the gracious intercession of the Lady Margaret, who was just setting out on her wedding journey and who did not forget, if her brother did, that the mercer had helped to make her marriage possible, that he was as much as admitted to bail.[1]

Margaret must have felt that she was leaving her native land under not very happy circumstances. Yet to outward appearances all was bright and gay, and as if to convince the world that the king was on the best of terms with everyone, both Warwick and Wenlock were in attendance on the bride. Warwick was not to accompany Margaret across the sea, but Wenlock was to do so, and so were scores of other gentlemen,[2] to say nothing of forty or fifty ladies. The Bishop of Salisbury and Thomas Vaughan, the two men who had had most to do with the marriage negotiations, were already in Flanders awaiting Margaret's coming, while with her travelled not only Wenlock, but Lord Scales, who was to act as her "presenter," Lord Dacre, who was to serve as her chamberlain, Sir John Howard, and Sir John Woodville, as well as Sir John Scott, Sir Thomas Montgomery, William Hatclyf, John Russell, and Henry Sharp, who, with some of the others, were to represent the king at the diet at Bruges which was to have met on 20th March but had been postponed until 10th May and afterwards until 28th June.[3] The noblest of the ladies in the bride's train was the Duchess of Norfolk, the beautiful Elizabeth Talbot, who received two hundred pounds from the king for the pleasant task of attending on his sister;[1] and for the entertainment of all the company Edward sent along two of his fools, John le Saige and Richard l'Amoureux.[2]

---

[1] Worcester, 789-790; Fabyan, 656.

[2] It is said that eighteen hundred persons accompanied Margaret to Flanders. Commynes-Lenglet, II, 192.

[3] For the commissions of the men who were to represent the king at the diet, see Writs of Privy Seal, file 819, no. 2455; French Roll 8 Edw. IV, m. 32; Diplomatic Documents (Exchequer T. of R.), no. 1073. Montgomery's name was inserted in the commission later. Cal. Documents relating to Scotland, IV, 279. For payments to Wenlock, Dacre, and several others for their attendance on Margaret, see Warrants for Issues, 8 Edw. IV, 8th June; Issue Roll, Easter 8 Edw. IV, 13th June.

Edward had undertaken to provide his sister with suitable apparel, plate, and other necessaries, and he seems to have fulfilled his promise in a sufficiently generous manner. Out of the tenth just granted to him by convocation he devoted £2,450 6*s.* 8*d.* to "the apparel, costs, and expenses of Margaret, our right entirely beloved sister." The purchases made for her included "a couple of gilt pots for our said sister, £20; item, for two basins with ewers for her, £20; item, a spoon of gold for her, £4; item, a pair of carving knives for her, £3; item, a dozen garnished silver vessels for her, £120; item, for beddings, carpets, and cushions, etc., £100." Four hundred pounds to which she was entitled "by reason of certain patents and tallies" were also paid over to Margaret, and she was given five hundred pounds "for money to be had with her in her coffers," while Sir John Scott, who seems to have acted as her steward during her journey, received two hundred pounds "upon account for the diet of our said sister from London to Bruges."[3]

It was on 18th June that Margaret, escorted by Warwick and many other earls and barons besides those who were to go with her to her journey's end, set out from the King's Wardrobe at the Blackfriars and, after offerings had been made at St. Paul's and the mayor and aldermen had presented a wedding gift of a pair of silver gilt basins containing one hundred pounds in gold,[4] turned her face towards the country which was to be her home for the rest of her life. The first stage of her journey ended at the monastery of Stratford Langthorne, where the king and queen were staying and where she spent several days, probably to enjoy some farewell feastings. At last, however, with her three brothers, Edward, Clarence, and Gloucester added to her escort, she proceeded to Canterbury and, on the 23rd, to Margate, where the *New Ellen* of London, which was to have the honour of carrying the bride herself, and thirteen other ships were waiting to take the bridal company to Flanders.[1]

---

[1] Warrants for Issues and Issue Roll, *ut sup.* As the two hundred pounds were paid to the Duke of Norfolk for his wife, it is evident that Sir James Ramsay's supposition that it was the Dowager Duchess of Norfolk who went with Margaret is incorrect.

[2] Laborde, Les Ducs de Bourgogne, I, 500-501.

[3] Warrants for Issues, 8 Edw. IV, 8th June.

[4] London Journal 7, f. 175; Sharpe, I, 309-310.

As soon as Margaret had sailed away, the king and his party hurried back to London, where the trial of those who had been accused by Cornelius and Hawkins was about to begin. Probably because Edward wanted them to think that he still regarded their loyalty as above suspicion, both Clarence and Warwick had been named among the commissioners before whom the supposed traitors were to be tried. So had been the Earls of Northumberland and Rivers and a number of other noblemen.[2] But the real work probably devolved on three other members of the commission, the mayor of London, Chief Justice Markham, and Thomas Lyttleton. From such a judge as Markham, who was popularly known as "the upright judge,"[3] the prisoners might well hope for a fair trial, and in all likelihood they would have received one had nothing else occurred to inflame the king's mind against them. Unluckily, however, at this moment there came news from Wales which seemed to confirm the stories of Cornelius and Hawkins.

Up to the last moment the king of France had gone on hoping that this difficulty or that would put a stop to the marriage of Margaret and Charles and save him from the dangerous position in which he would be placed if the king of England and the Duke of Burgundy became united by so close a tie. But one by one all obstacles to the marriage had been removed, and when the wedding day was approaching, Louis found relief for his discomfiture in besmirching the character of the bride. On 2nd July the Milanese ambassador at his court, drawing the information, it is safe to assume, from Louis himself, wrote home that the Duke of Burgundy had made great preparations for his coming nuptials but, "because he is informed of what more and more people know, to wit, that his future consort in the past has been somewhat devoted to love affairs, indeed in the opinion of many she even has a son," he had issued a public edict forbidding anyone, in private or in public, to "make mention or speak of such a thing under pain of being thrown into the river forthwith."[4]

---

[1] Fabyan, 656; Kingsford's London Chron., 179; Hearne's Fragment, 296; Chron. of John Stone, 103; Excerpta Historica, 227-228; Warrants for Issues, *ut sup.;* La Marche, V, 96.

[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 103. Cf. Worcester, 790.

[3] Foss, Judges of England.

[4] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 124. One Pietro Aliprando, who had a venomous dislike for all things English, wrote to the Duke of Milan several years later:

However, in spite of all mud-throwing the marriage was going to take place, and Louis had to seek some protection more efficacious than slander. What he found was the Earl of Pembroke, and while Charles was waiting for his bride, Pembroke, with Louis' connivance and help, was making ready to land on the coast of Wales. But just as when he sent Brezé to Scotland with Queen Margaret, Louis defeated his own object by the stinginess of the help he gave. He ordered three ships to be fitted out for Pembroke's use at Honfleur,[1] and when the earl set sail about 24th June, his whole equipment consisted of these three ships, about fifty men, and a small sum of money. In the same letter in which he mentioned the tales about Margaret of York, the Milanese ambassador stated that word had been received that Pembroke, on landing in Wales, had put some four thousand Englishmen to death and was now "devoting himself to gathering as many of his partisans there as he can in order to set himself forward."[2] But as a matter of fact the earl's progress was by no means triumphant. Landing near Harlech, he found the place so closely surrounded by Lord Herbert's men that it was hopeless to try to reach the castle, and when his tiny fleet turned homeward, one of his ships was captured. However, Harlech could not have withstood attack all these years had its defenders not found many friends in North Wales, and when Pembroke, giving up all hope of getting into Harlech, marched inland, his little army grew to such a size that he was able to take and burn Denbigh. Yet his victory proved to be only a momentary one, as before the ashes of Denbigh were cool, Lord Herbert's brother appeared in the neighbourhood and utterly routed him. Pembroke himself escaped to some hiding place and in time got back to France, but twenty of his men were taken and beheaded and the rest either fled or surrendered. Nor was this the worst, as the disastrous ending of the relief expedition from which they had hoped to get help disheartened the plucky little garrison in Harlech that had shown a defiant face to the world so long. In despair

---

"Of a truth, O my lord, all is not well between the Duke of Burgundy and the king of England on account of the duchess, who did not go to her husband a virgin." *Ibid.*, I, 170.

[1] In MS. français 20,496, f. 91, is preserved the original order from Louis to Antoine Raguier, treasurer of war, to pay 293*l.* 5*s.* 5*d.* to Louis Toustain for the victualling of the ships at Honfleur "pour le passage du Conte de Panebrock en Angleterre."

[2] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 125.

the captain of Harlech, David ap Jevan ap Enyon,[1] surrendered the castle to Lord Herbert on 14th August, and fifty prisoners, among whom were ap Jevan himself, Sir Richard Tunstall, Sir Henry Bellingham, Sir Robert Whitingham, Sir William Stoke, a Northumberland squire named Thomas Elwyk, and one John Trueblode, were carried by Herbert to the Tower of London. Herbert was rewarded for his long-delayed victory with a gift of the earldom of Pembroke,[2] whose rightful possessor had forfeited it by his refusal to submit to Edward of York, and a little later his prisoners were brought to trial before the constable of England. None of the prisoners had reason to look for tender treatment, and yet only Elwyk and Trueblode were beheaded on Tower Hill, while Tunstall and Bellingham were given general pardons in October and Sir William Stoke was equally fortunate some months later.[3]

There was another man, however, to whom the Earl of Pembroke's expedition brought very heavy and probably quite unmerited suffering. The moment he was told of Pembroke's landing in Wales, Edward jumped to the conclusion that all that the man Cornelius had confessed was true; and for the reason, it is to be feared, that Sir Thomas Cook had great wealth, he chose to make a special victim of him. Cook was rearrested and this time sent to the Tower, while his wife[4] was committed to the custody of the mayor of London. Then the treasurer of England, Earl Rivers, who " to the said Sir Thomas was a great enemy," and the treasurer of the king's household, John Fogge, ransacked both the mercer's town house and his country house; and though they probably pretended to be searching for proofs of his guilt, they carried off not merely his papers, but his most valuable goods and chattels, including a gilded salt-cellar—so important a feature of the dinner table of those days—spoons, chargers, platters, plates, saucers, spice-plates, candelabra, cushions, bed hangings, and several pieces of arras representing the history of Nebuchadnezzar, the Passion, the Judgment, and the life of Alexander. Sixteen hundred pounds' worth of woollen cloth, probably the entire stock Cook had on hand, was also seized and ultimately found its way into the hands of the king's creditor, Gerard Caniziani.[1]

---

[1] Rolls of Parl., V, 486. Worcester simplifies the captain's name into David Abenon.

[2] 28th September. Charter Roll 8-10 Edw. IV, m. 15; Signed Bills, file 1500, no. 4261; Worcester, 791.

[3] Worcester, *ut sup.*; Gregory, 237; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 182.

[4] She was the daughter and heiress of Philip Malpas. See a pardon granted to her on 20th December, 1471. Pardon Roll 11 Edw. IV, m. 28.

In the excitement of the moment Cook's guilt had been taken for granted, and yet when a number of the men Cornelius and Hawkins had accused were tried at the Guildhall early in July, the jury found the mercer guilty of nothing worse than misprision of treason. At the same time Plummer, who had fled to the Westminster sanctuary and had been deprived of his aldermanry by the mayor and his fellow aldermen,[2] Humphrey Hayford, and two other men, Hugh Pakenham and Thomas Portaleyn,[3] were acquitted outright, although some excuse was found for demanding fines from them. And Hugh Mille, who, if innocent at this time, was certainly guilty of treason a little later, as he joined the king's enemies in Wales in a few months, successfully pleaded a pardon which had been granted to him the year before. On the other hand, Huse was outlawed, and Hawkins, Peter Alfray, and one John Norris were condemned to die.[4]

No organized plot had been unearthed, but enough had been discovered to show that Margaret of Anjou was still at work in England, and at one moment Edward had been so alarmed that he gave orders for the requisition of every ship in every port of his realm.[5] When his fright was over, however, the king evinced his old readiness to forgive and forget. Though Hawkins and Norris were hanged at Tyburn, Alfray received a pardon at the foot of the gallows from the hands of the Archbishop of York, who seems to have interceded for him.[6] In fact, by this time a pardon had been offered to all who would ask for it before the coming St. John's Day,[1] and from the size of the pardon roll for this and the succeeding year, it is evident that many people were glad to avail themselves of the king's offer. Plummer, notwithstanding his acquittal, was one of the first to seek his bit of parchment, and Hayford followed his example, though his pardon did not save him from the loss of his aldermanry, on 9th December, by the king's express order.[2] Even Cook was granted a pardon on 26th July.[3] But this did not mean that the mercer recovered his property or that he escaped other penalties. From the Tower he was sent to the Bread Street Counter and from the Bread Street Counter to the King's Bench prison, and on 21st November he, like Hayford, was deprived of his aldermanry by the king's command.[4] Not until he had paid a fine of eight thousand pounds was he set at liberty, and even then Elizabeth Woodville came forward with a demand, based on the ancient right of "queen's gold," that for every thousand pounds he paid to the king by way of fine he must pay her a hundred marks. Not without a struggle did Cook submit to this further mulcting, but in the end he had to give the queen what she wanted, and "many good gifts" to her counsel besides.[5]

---

[1] Worcester, 789-790; Fabyan, 656; Kingsford's London Chron., 179; Gregory, 236-237; Warkworth, 5; Issue Rolls, Easter 8 Edw. IV, 1st June, 5th July, and Easter 9 Edw. IV, 17th July.

[2] 4th July. London Journal 7, f. 175.

[3] Pakenham had been sheriff of Wiltshire in 1458. Portaleyn was a London mercer. See a pardon granted to him on 2nd December, 1471. Pardon Roll 11 Edw. IV, m. 32.

[4] Warkworth, Gregory, and Worcester, *ut sup.*; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 21, 104, 117, 238; Warrants for Issues, 8 Edw. IV, 27th July—a warrant to pay £1,000 to William Kerver and John Rogger out of the fines paid, or to be paid, by Sir Thomas Cook, Sir John Plummer, Humphrey Hayford, John Shukbourgh, Thomas Portaleyn, William Belknap, John Daunton, and Hugh Pakenham. Seizures of goods belonging to Plummer, Alfray, and one William Britte, a London upholder who was also accused of treason, are accounted for by Mayor Olgrave as escheator of London. Enrolled Accounts, Escheators Accounts, 75.

[5] Writs of Privy Seal, file 820, no. 2528, 3rd August.

[6] Worcester; Gregory. Alfray's pardon was sealed on 14th July. Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 92. He was a draper. See a later pardon granted to him. Pardon Roll 11 Edw. IV, m. 24.

So far as one can tell from this distance of time, Cook's sufferings were entirely undeserved. His sole accuser was Hawkins, a man whose ill-will he had incurred two or three years before by refusing to loan him a thousand marks which Hawkins himself stated were intended for the use of Queen Margaret. Moreover, when brought almost to the point of death by the torture he was subjected to, Hawkins made a solemn confession that Cook was innocent of everything of which he had accused him, and this declaration he repeated on the day of his execution. The truth of the whole ugly story seems to be that Earl Rivers and his wife, who for some reason wanted to get rid of Cook, played upon the cupidity of the king, who was always, and at this time particularly, in search of money, in order to accomplish their purpose. It was Rivers, too, who, because Chief Justice Markham had baffled his wish by charging the jury to find a verdict against Cook of misprision only, managed, to the king's shame as well as his own, to have the chief justice removed from his office.[1] To add to the pity of the thing, the money the king got from Cook was scarcely a drop in the bucket. During the next few months Edward borrowed thousands of pounds from the Genoese and Venetian merchants and from Caniziani, and yet after all that he had to pawn some of his jewels. Upon certain of the king's "great jewels" Hugh Bryce borrowed £1,676 13*s.* 4*d.* from his friends and passed the money over to his Majesty, who used it, so he claimed, "to the defence of this our realm."[2]

---

[1] Writs of Privy Seal, file 821, no. 2585, 12th July.

[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 96, 106, 107; London Journal 7, f. 184. Hayford became mayor of London in 1477.

[3] Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 98.

[4] London Journal 7, f. 182.

[5] Fabyan, 656-657; Kingsford's London Chron., 179; Gregory, xxxiii-xxxv. Among Exchequer Miscellanea 8/27 are some enrolled writs for levying the queen's gold, 5 to 20 Edw. IV, but they contain no reference to Cook.

Long before Sir Thomas Cook had bought his liberty, the fair lady who had befriended him in the first days of his trouble had become duchess of Burgundy. As her fourteen ships had been well equipped to resist Frenchmen,[3] Margaret of York's voyage to her new home was marred by no unpleasant accident, and she landed at Sluys on Saturday, 25th June, just one week from the day she left London. The Bishop of Utrecht, one of Charles's numerous illegitimate brothers, and many other lords and ladies were waiting to welcome her, and when she entered the town, she found it illuminated with torches and bonfires, and three pageants, telling the stories of Jason and the Golden Fleece, of Esther, and of Vashti, ready to be presented on a stage in the market place—in pantomime, apparently, as "all was countenance and no words." The next day Isabella of Portugal and Mary of Burgundy came from Bruges with a goodly company, including "Lord Jakes" of Luxembourg, and on Monday Charles himself arrived at the castle and that evening had his first meeting with his bride.

Although the slanderous story about Margaret with which the king of France had gratified his spite was probably utterly false, Charles certainly never had regarded a marriage with a daughter of the house of York with anything but repugnance; and it was not until his bride had set foot in his domains that he broke his last tie with the house of Lancaster by sending the Duke of Somerset, the brother of his former friend, away from Bruges.[4] But Margaret's beauty seems to have taken the duke's heart by storm the moment he saw her, and when, on Thursday, he came to see her again and she met him at the hall door, he "kissed her in the open sight of all the people of both nations." Indeed, he was so delighted that he kissed "all the ladies and gentlewomen that were English, and other he would not." On Friday he came back to get another kiss, and then prosaically "rode to Bruges to his dinner."

---

[1] Stow, 420; Gregory, *ut sup.*

[2] Receipt Rolls, Easter and Mich. 8 Edw. IV; Warrants for Issues, 8 Edw. IV, 3rd Feb. The money Bryce borrowed for the king was afterwards repaid by assignments on the fifteenths and tenths granted by the Commons.

[3] La Marche says that four of them in particular were "moult aptes à la guerre."

[4] Paston Letters, IV, 299.

The wedding was to take place in the beautiful *stadhuis* at Damme which, with the great half-ruined church near by, still recalls the ancient importance of that now forgotten little canal town; and to Damme Margaret proceeded by boat on Saturday. Charles met her there early the next morning, and between five and six o'clock the Bishop of Salisbury, assisted by the Bishop of Tournai, performed the marriage ceremony and John Gunthorp delivered an address.[1] On Monday, to the sound of trumpets and "melodious minstrelsy" but, unluckily, under weeping skies, the bride made her entry into Bruges dressed in white cloth of gold and ermine, with a crown of gold on her flowing hair, and seated on a litter of crimson cloth of gold. Fountains of wine and hippocras made all hearts merry, and there were ten pageants which one of the Pastons declared to be "the best that ever I see."[2] The feastings went on for nine days and there were many tournaments in the market place, in some of which Lord Scales and the Bastard of Burgundy took part, though not as rivals this time, as they had given a pledge at the close of the great Smithfield tournament never to oppose each other in arms again. But the prizes fell to the Prince of Orange and Sir John Woodville—perhaps in part because this time, too, a horse played the Bastard an ill turn, striking him on the leg, as he was accompanying Lord Scales into the field, and hurting him "so sore," wrote Paston regretfully, "that I can think he shall be of no power to accomplish up his arms."[3]

If Charles had set out not only to please his bride, but to impress her countrymen, he certainly succeeded. "There were never

---

[1] There is a copy of Gunthorp's address in the Bodleian Library, MS. Bodley 587. See the article on Gunthorp in Dict. Nat. Biography.

[2] The ninth pageant is omitted in the account of the marriage in Excerpta Historica.

[3] Paston Letters, IV, 298. Cf. La Marche, III, 172. For full details of the nuptial festivities, see Excerpta Historica, 227-239; La Marche, III, 101-120; IV, 95-144; Haynin, I, 106-132; Waurin, II, 368-372; Bulletins de la Com. Royale d'Histoire, Belgique, Series I, Vol. V, 168-174; Gilliodts-van-Severen, Inventaire des Archives de Bruges, V, 565 *et seq.*

Englishmen," exclaimed Paston, "had so good cheer out of England that ever I heard of"; and "as for the duke's court," he added, "as for lords, ladies, and gentlewomen, knights, squires, and gentlemen, I heard never of none like to it, save King Arthur's court." But the gorgeous festivities came to an abrupt end, because in the midst of them Charles heard that the king of France was preparing to make war on the Duke of Brittany. On 12th July the bridegroom bade his English guests a hasty farewell, after distributing costly gifts among them, and on the following day departed for Holland. The Englishmen stayed on, however, as the diet which had been as much an object of their coming as the marriage itself did not end until the 18th.[1] But alas! it turned out that Charles's hospitality did not include the "enlarging" of English cloth. The diet seems to have produced no result except an agreement for the holding of two other diets, a preliminary one at Antwerp on 15th September, to be composed of representatives of the merchants of England and Burgundy, and a final one at Bruges, Calais, or St. Omer to which the king of England and the Duke of Burgundy were to send commissioners authorized to settle all controversies between the two countries.[2]

Charles's failure to revoke the edict against English cloth even after the wedding, was probably a great surprise as well as disappointment to Edward. It certainly was to Edward's subjects, and many of the men who had accompanied Margaret to Flanders returned to England in a very grumbling mood. While the wedding gaieties were still going on, Paston had written in high praise of Charles's people, whom he described as "the goodliest fellowship that ever I came among, and best can behave them, and most like gentlemen"; but others complained, when they came home, that "the Burgoners showed no more favour unto Englishmen than they would do unto a Jew. For meat and drink was dear enough as though it had been in the land of war, for a shoulder of mutton was sold for 12*d*. And as for bedding, Lyard my horse had more ease than had some good yeomen, for my horse stood in the house and the yeomen sometimes lay without in the street. For less than 4*d*. a man should not have a bed a night. Lo! how soon they could play the niggards!"[3]

[1] Paston Letters, IV, 299; La Marche, III, 201; Commynes-Lenglet, II, 192.

[2] French Roll 9 Edw. IV, m. 18, 23rd May. Cf. *ibid.*, m. 17.

[3] Gregory, 238.

Nor did the disgust with Burgundy wear itself out in mere grumbling. It culminated in a plot to get rid of the Flemings who were living and carrying on their trades in Southwark. The conspirators were four or five hundred members of the crafts of goldsmiths, skinners, tailors, and cordwainers, and all their arrangements had been completed when, at the eleventh hour, one Roger Copeland told the whole story to the mayor and aldermen, naming William Shaw, a skinner, as the ringleader. Thereupon a number of arrests were made, and when, on 1st September, the culprits were brought before the mayor and aldermen, Shaw confessed that he and fifty-six other men had planned to meet at Limehouse the night before, cross the river to Rotherhithe between five and six o'clock in the morning, and with the help of the men of Southwark, hunt out the Flemings there, because they "took away the living of English people," and cut off their thumbs and hands, so that they could never again "help themself by mean of craft."[1]

A plot to mutilate the subjects of the king's new brother-in-law within sight of Westminster Palace was an offence not to be condoned, and Shaw and his fellow conspirators had to languish in prison for a time. Yet there were other strangers within London's gates who were receiving very harsh treatment at this moment from the king's own hands.

In March, 1466, Edward had told the Hansards that they must send an embassy to him within two years if they wished to retain their privileges in his kingdom; and he had repeated this demand a year later when, at the special request of the city of Hamburg, he confirmed their privileges once more. But the Hansards still shrank from sending the embassy, and when, in December, 1467, Hamburg and Cologne asked for the holding of a diet at Cologne instead, Edward's patience gave out. He emphatically refused the request, and though he afterwards consented to extend the Hansards' privileges until St. John's Day, 1469, once more he insisted that an embassy must be sent to him within that time. Evidently he used strong language, as the London Hansards took fright and wrote to Lubeck that, unless great care were taken, the privileges which they had enjoyed in England so long, and which their forefathers had worked so hard to procure, were likely to be lost.[2] None the less Edward really wanted to keep on good terms with the Hansards, and probably his little difference with them would have been patched up in time if a new and serious complication had not been added to the situation.

---

[1] London Journal 7, f. 178. Gregory gives a slight account of this affair. According to him, the Flemings were to be dragged out of their beds and killed.

[2] Hanserecesse, II, 6, pp. 28-32, 61-63; French Roll, 7 Edw. IV, m. 7.

According to an old agreement between England and Denmark, which had been confirmed by the treaty of October, 1465, it was unlawful for any subject of the king of England to go to Iceland without a permit from the king of Denmark. In spite of this, however, some fishermen from Lynton and Bristol had landed on that island in the summer of 1467 and had robbed and pillaged there; and in June, 1468, King Christian, who had complained to Edward but had been offered no redress, seized four English ships which were passing through the Sound on their way to Prussia. Unfortunately for the London Hansards, the story carried to England was that the seizure of the four ships had been made at their instigation by some ships of Dantzic which were in Christian's service; and as a result, on 29th July the mayor and aldermen of London, by command of Edward and his council, went to the Steelyard, sealed up the doors of the warehouses, and sent the Hansards living there to the Ludgate Counter, while orders went out for the arrest of all other Hanseatic merchants in all parts of the kingdom. On their arrival at the Ludgate Counter, the prisoners were informed, to their intense dismay, that unless they could prove their innocence by Michaelmas, they would have to pay a fine of twenty thousand pounds, the estimated value of the four ships. In the meantime, too, they had to loan the king a thousand pounds on the understanding that this amount would be deducted from their fine, should it turn out that they had to pay one.[1]

The imprisonment of one group of Hansards, the men of Cologne, was of short duration, as the ancient enmity between Cologne and Denmark made it unlikely that they had had any hand in the seizure of the ships. But the rest of the Easterlings, fretting and fuming, continued in durance. At the end of September Christian wrote to Edward that the Dantzic men had not been responsible for the taking of the ships; and the king of Poland, the Bishop of Utrecht, and the Emperor himself tried to intercede on behalf of their respective subjects.[2] But all to no use. On 20th November the king's council, sitting in the Star Chamber, decreed that the

---

[1] Hanserecesse, II, 6, pp. 69-76; II, 7, p. 117.
[2] *Ibid.*, II, 6, 83-85, 90-91, 124.

English merchants who had suffered loss should receive compensation out of the goods of the Hansards, those of the Cologne merchants excepted,[1] and the next day the Hansards were brought into the Star Chamber and sentenced to pay their fine of twenty thousand pounds. When it was found that they were not ready to do this, they were all conducted back to prison, with the exception of Herman Wanmate, their secretary, and a few others, who escaped to sanctuary.

"Peter Bodenclop they have in the Broad Street Counter," wrote Wanmate from the Westminster sanctuary. "Gerard von Wesel has escaped, I do not know where or how or whence. The messenger who brought the Emperor's letters they searched for in very many places, and when they found him, they beat him between his shoulders so that his nose bled. They also, by authority, sought in his breeches to see whether he had any letters, but as God would have it, I and Knele had received the letters from him." "There have been strange and mischievous doings near the harbour and among the halls," continued the discouraged writer, "with the breaking open of divers chambers, but where I do not know, since no one has escaped who can tell me." But the next day he added a more cheerful postscript. Armed with the Emperor's letters and also with some from Cologne, he had gone to the king and his council to ask for mercy, and though in the meantime another member of the fellowship had been brought to the Counter "and set in irons, as I understand," he thought the king was more inclined to listen to reason. They would probably know very soon, he said, what decision the king and his council had made, "and, please God, all will be for the best, as this evening by the king's command Gerard von Wesel is set free by the sergeant of arms at the Steelyard in order to take charge of the Steelyard and the merchants' hall again." "Both sides," were Wanmate's final words, "wish they had not pushed the matter so far."[2]

But Edward still stuck to his demands, though he was, in fact, beginning to regret what he had done. On 5th December the mayor and sheriffs of London were ordered to arrest all merchants of the German Hanse, except those of Cologne, who were not already in prison, and to take possession of their goods;[1] and although the time the Hansards had been given to pay their fine was extended to the last week in January, they were told that at the end of that time their goods would be confiscated outright if the twenty thousand pounds were not paid. Shortly after this Wanmate was permitted to go over to Utrecht to see what help he could get there,[2] but his friends remained in prison, and when the last day of January came, they still refused to pay their fine. By this time, however, the Duke of Burgundy had begun to show concern about the imprisoned merchants, and this soon had its effect on Edward. On 29th March the king wrote to the chancellor that he had "taken a direction betwixt our subjects and the merchants of the Hanse being in ward at the suit of our said subjects, as well for the demeaning of their goods as for the enlarging of their persons," and that he wanted the prisoners to be brought before his council on the coming Tuesday, so that he could arrange to have them set at liberty and then inform "our brother of Burgundy and other princes which afore this time have specially written to us for the favour of the said merchants" that this had been done.[3] Meanwhile the treasurer of England went to the prisoners and gave them to understand that, as the king had been asked by many princes and cities to show them grace, and as he desired the continuance of the old friendship between England and the Hanse towns, he himself would provide a part of the money needed to satisfy the claims of his subjects against them.

---

[1] Signed Bills, file 1527, no. 5657.

[2] Hanserecesse, II, 6, pp. 90-91. Although the Cologne men were allowed to take charge of the Steelyard, this year at least they were required to pay the poll tax on foreign merchants notwithstanding the exemption which the Hansards had obtained. Gerard von Wesel, as a householder, paid 40*s*., and nine other merchants of Cologne paid 20*s*. each. Alien Subsidies, bundle 236, no. 123. It would appear, therefore, that there were only ten Cologne men at the Steelyard at this time and that only Gerard von Wesel was ranked as a householder.

The king was as good as his word; for when the prisoners were brought before him, he announced that, if they would pay four thousand nobles, he would pay the rest of their fine. And as the distracted Hansards had had all the prison life they wanted, they decided to accept the king's offer. The rest of their goods were to be consigned to the care of disinterested parties until the last day of August, and in the meantime the king was to send an embassy to the court of Burgundy to meet an embassy from the Hanse towns and treat for peace. If the negotiations ended satisfactorily, the merchants were to get their goods back again, but if they ended unsatisfactorily, the king was to have the goods.[1]

---

[1] Signed Bills, *ut sup.*

[2] Hanserecesse, II, 6, pp. 91-93.

[3] Warrants under the Signet, file 1381, 29th March, 9 Edw. IV. Cf. Signed Bills, *ut sup.*

The promise to send an embassy to Burgundy to treat with the Hansards was no small concession on Edward's part, as he had insisted so long that they must send an embassy to him in England. But the truth was that he was heartily tired of the fuss he had stirred up. So he not only wrote a letter to the Hanse towns in which, while attempting to justify the sentence pronounced against their merchants in England, he made known his intention to send the embassy to Bruges, but he also confirmed the old privileges of the Hansards until the last day of August.[2]

---

[1] Hanserecesse, II, 6, pp. 125-126.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 155, 161, 178, 190, 192-193; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 157.

CHAPTER VI

WARWICK'S FIRST FAILURE

THE marriage bells of Margaret of York and Charles of Burgundy, ringing in, to all appearances, a new era of close co-operation between England and Burgundy, sounded very like a knell to the ears of Louis XI, who had moved heaven and earth to prevent the marriage and now, having failed, could almost hear the tramp of English and Burgundian armies marching once more over a prostrate France. It was inevitable, too, Louis' fears told him, that this tightening of the bond between England and Burgundy should lead to a close alliance between England and Brittany as well. And, indeed, while the marriage festivities were going on at Bruges, Edward ratified the thirty years' mercantile treaty Francis had offered, renewed his treaty of amity and mutual defence with the duke, and also signed a promise that he and his heirs and successors would protect the duchy of Brittany and all other territories belonging to Francis against any person attempting to molest them.[1] Louis may have said to himself, when he heard that the English Commons had granted money for war with France, that it was much easier for Edward to talk of invading France than to do it. Nevertheless, he knew that, if the king of England and the Dukes of Burgundy and Brittany were banded together, sooner or later he would have to fight for his life, unless by swift action or dextrous diplomacy he succeeded in breaking up their alliance. So promptly, therefore, that Charles had to tear himself away from his bride of a few days, Louis had struck at the weaker of the two men he feared in the hope that he would be able to overwhelm Francis before Charles and Edward could rally to their ally's support. It was impossible, however, for a single sharp blow at one of his enemies to save him, and while his troops were marching toward the borders of Brittany, he was casting about for some means of reducing Edward also to harmlessness. He could not send an army to attack England as he was attacking Brittany; he lacked both the power and the daring for such an enterprise. But the eagerness Edward had shown for the Burgundian marriage had suggested to him an altogether different plan of action, a plan of which he now hastened to make use and of which he became so enamoured that he continued to use it in all his subsequent dealings with Edward. In spite of his own strange selection of a wife, the king of England, Louis had decided, was very anxious to strengthen his house by foreign marriage alliances and, patterning after Charles himself, Louis proceeded to allure Edward by an offer of a marriage alliance between the houses of Valois and York. He proposed to wed one of his daughters to the Duke of Clarence, who, as Edward had no son, might one day succeed to the throne of England.

---

[1] Rymer, XI, 618-624; French Roll 8 Edw. IV, m. 21; Writs of Privy Seal, file 819, nos. 2480, 2483. Cf. Dupuy, I, 200-201. Francis put his seal to the renewal of the treaty of amity and mutual defence on 8th July. Rymer, XI, 624.

Edward did not refuse to listen to this new suggestion from Louis any more than he had refused to listen to the proposals Louis had made while the marriage of Margaret and Charles was still an uncertainty, and on 1st August he gave a commission to the keeper of the privy seal, Thomas Rotheram, now Bishop of Rochester, to treat with the French king for a perpetual peace or a truce and settlement of differences. Nevertheless, two days later the great seal of England was attached to the agreement to send three thousand English archers to the Duke of Brittany, and when Rotheram left London on 4th August, though he had been given six yards of violet ingrain, six yards of scarlet, and eleven yards of sarcenet out of which he was probably expected to concoct a costume handsome enough to make an impression on Louis and his court, his orders were to demand of Louis the surrender of the territories in France to which the king of England laid claim.[1] Moreover, instead of going at once to France, Rotheram proceeded to Brittany, where by this time one part of Louis' army was laying siege to Ancenis, while another was recovering the towns in Normandy which Francis had seized and had offered to hand over to Edward. From the progress Louis' troops were making, it was evident that Francis could not hold out much longer unless he had help. Yet the duke took courage when he saw Edward's sealed promise to send him three thousand archers, and on 14th August he agreed not to make any treaty either with the king of France or with the king of Scotland that would be detrimental to the king of England. On the following day he also sealed the pledge he had given to surrender to Edward any places he might capture in France,[1] and then Rotheram, taking with him the Seigneur de Concressault, whose ransom he had paid, went to Dieppe and from there, at the end of August, to Noyon to meet Louis.[2] "Two days ago," wrote the Milanese ambassador from Senlis on 31st August, "an embassy of the English arrived here. Yesterday they went to the king, and from what I hear they have come to negotiate a truce with his Majesty and say that they are content to have an understanding and friendship together, and also to treat about the marriage of that sovereign's second daughter, although they say she is somewhat deformed in person, chiefly in one shoulder, to King Edward's brother. The origin of this is that the king here, by indirect ways, has succeeded in getting these proposals brought forward, so that he may not have so many enemies to meet, so that they might have reason to consent to the truce and not send six thousand archers to Brittany to help the duke there, as they proposed to do. This idea has been revived, and so far as can be gathered, the French king in his own interests wishes to attend to the truce, but he will dissimulate about the marriage alliance until he sees how things are going."[3]

---

[1] Rymer, XI, 625-626, 628; Writs of Privy Seal, file 819, no. 2479; Warrants for Issues, 8 Edw. IV, 24th Oct.; Issue Rolls, Mich. 8 Edw. IV, 29th March, and Easter 8 Edw. IV, 25th June. Rotheram was paid five marks a day for the period of his absence, 4th August to 4th October.

Louis succeeded in keeping Rotheram with him the better part of a month,[4] and that gave him as much time as he needed to accomplish the first of his purposes, the severance of the Duke of Brittany from his allies. On 1st September Edward responded to the promise Francis had made not to enter into any treaty with the kings of France or Scotland that would injure him by promising not to make any treaty with the king of France or any other person that would be harmful to Francis or in violation of his agreements with him;[5] and on the 10th he signed indentures with Lord Mountjoy and Lord Scales, who were to command the expedition going to Francis's support.[6] For six months, according to the indentures,

---

[1] Palgrave, Kalendars of the Exchequer, III, 11; Rymer, XI, 628.

[2] Legrand's history, MS. français 6961, f. 367; Lettres de Louis XI, itinéraire.

[3] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 125.

[4] *Ibid.*, I, 125-126. The writer of this letter seems to have mistaken the Bishop of Rochester for the Archbishop of Canterbury.

[5] Dupuy, I, 201.

[6] Warrants for Issues, 8 Edw. IV, 13th Sept. and 26th Oct.; Issue Rolls,

Mountjoy was to "do good and diligent service unto the high and mighty prince, our cousin, the Duke of Brittany, in his wars against our and his adversary, Louis, calling himself king of France," with three thousand men, while apparently the task assigned to Scales, who was to take with him three thousand soldiers and eleven hundred mariners, was to make a descent somewhere on the coast of France at the moment that Francis and Mountjoy made a thrust into the interior of Louis' kingdom. But though Mountjoy's men were to be mustered at Portsmouth on 28th September and Scales's at Gravesend and Sandwich on the same day, even that was longer than Francis could wait. After dispatching a frantic appeal for assistance to Charles and receiving no response, Francis gave up the struggle and, on the very day that Edward's indentures with Mountjoy and Scales were signed, agreed to a treaty of peace with Louis by a secret article of which he shamelessly renounced all his allies.[1]

Charles was so infuriated when he learned of the treaty of Ancenis that the herald who brought the letters from the Dukes of Brittany and Normandy giving news of it thought his own unlucky head was going to pay the forfeit.[2] And Edward's anger was probably as great as Charles's, if not so passionately expressed. Certainly he had quite as much cause for anger as Charles; for Francis had already sent ships to Plymouth to assist in transporting Mountjoy's men to Brittany, and at the first news of what had happened, the masters of those ships hoisted their sails and, without a word of warning to anyone, departed for home.[3] As Francis's ships faded from sight, not only did the alliance with Brittany vanish with them, but also the possibility of invading France; and perhaps for a moment, as he scanned the horizon of Europe, Edward asked himself if, after all, Warwick had not been in the right and he himself in the wrong. For one of the two "mightiest princes that holden of the crown of France" had succumbed before Louis' armies, and the other was not proving to be the kind and helpful brother-in-law he had expected to find in him. The diet of English and Burgundian merchants which was to have met at Antwerp on 15th September

---

Easter 8 Edw. IV, 12th Sept., and Mich. 8 Edw. IV, 26th Nov.; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 105, 127, 156. Scales's appointment as captain of the fleet did not pass the great seal until 7th October. Rymer, XI, 630.

[1] Morice, III, 188; Commynes, I, 126.

[2] *Ibid.*, I, 127.

[3] Worcester, 792.

had not taken place. It had been postponed until 20th January,[1] when the diet of ambassadors was to meet; and although on 9th September, at the request of the king and his council, the mercers' company had chosen three of their number, William Caxton, their governor at Bruges, William Redeknape, and John Pickering, to accompany "divers ambassadors into Flanders as for the enlarging of woollen cloth,"[2] it began to look as if Charles would always find some excuse for delay whenever the question of the repeal of his father's edict against the importation of English cloth was to be brought up.

On 4th October Rotheram returned to London.[3] But of course he brought no treaty with the French king, although Louis had politely paid his expenses during his stay in France, presented him with the customary gifts, and refunded the seventeen hundred crowns he had paid to ransom Monypenny.[4] "The English ambassadors, after receiving presents of numerous silver vessels, have returned home without effecting any thing for which they came," was the news the Milanese ambassador had sent home. "They were content to make a long truce and have an understanding with the king here. His Majesty refused them certain lands of this realm of importance which they claimed and upon which they pretend to have rights, to which he would not agree; and so they went back *re infecta*. The negotiations I wrote of having ceased, his Majesty now gives out that he means to help the old queen of England, sister of Duke John (of Calabria) and favour her in that enterprise as much as possible. However, so far I hear of nothing actual being done. We shall see when Duke John comes."[5]

But many things were to happen before Louis actually took up the cause of Margaret of Anjou again. For the present he seemed to have won success enough, as Francis had been brought to his knees and Edward was either so disgusted with his allies or so tempted by the glittering possibility Louis had suggested that, if he did not actually contemplate a complete change of policy and the restoration of the great seal to the Archbishop of York, at least Warwick and his friends had hopes of such an outcome.[1] Even Charles, feeling the awkwardness of the position he was left in, seemed to be inclined to come to terms with Louis. But the next event was the famous interview between Charles and Louis at Peronne, when Louis' rashness all but cost him his liberty. Charles resisted the temptation to make Louis his prisoner, but when the treaty of Peronne was signed, on 14th October, he forced the king to sanction his alliance with Edward. The duke, it is true, consented to promise not to give support to the English if they essayed to invade or in any other way injure France,[2] but this did not afford much comfort to Louis' perturbed soul when he learned, while Charles still had him in leash, that the king of England was seizing and arming Genoese galleys with the intention of invading France.[3]

---

[1] Signed Bills, file 1500, no. 4290, 1st May, 1469; French Roll 9 Edw. IV, m. 18, 23rd May, 1469.

[2] Blades, Life of Caxton (condensed edition), 151. The mercers afterwards decreed that Redeknape and Pickering should have £40 towards their expenses "for the embassy of the enlarging of woollen cloth in the Duke of Burgundy's lands." Pickering had been governor of the English merchants in the Netherlands in 1445, and he held that office again in 1474. Schanz, Eng. Handelspolitik, II, 577-578.

[3] Warrants for Issues, 8 Edw. IV, 24th Oct.

[4] Legrand's history, MS. français 6961, f. 367; Commynes-Lenglet, III, 138.

[5] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 126.

That Edward had designs on southern France was perfectly true. Apparently it had been the intention from the first that Scales should undertake some enterprise in that region when he and Mountjoy went forth, and when the treaty of Ancenis caused such an abrupt change in everyone's plans and made the invasion of France through Brittany impossible, Mountjoy offered "to go into any other place or places" the king might choose and was immediately commanded to join Scales with a thousand of his soldiers and five hundred of his mariners.[4] But Edward did not expect Scales and Mountjoy's modest force to conquer Guienne. Their expedition probably had two purposes: to prevent Louis from feeling too happy about what he had accomplished, and to find out what likelihood there was of getting help from some of the princes of the neighbourhood in case an invasion of southern France should be undertaken at some future time. With one of the kingdoms of the Spanish peninsula, Castile, Edward was already in alliance, and the negotiations which he had been carrying on for a year past

[1] Paston Letters, IV, 304.

[2] Commynes-Lenglet, III, 24.

[3] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 126-127; Lettres de Louis XI, III, 297-298. According to Worcester, Scales and Mountjoy had some Genoese galleys in their fleet.

[4] Warrants for Issues, 8 Edw. IV, 26th Oct. and 28th Nov.

with John of Aragon reached a happy termination on 21st October, when he and John simultaneously ratified a treaty of alliance between England and Aragon.[1] Yet while it was possible that Castile and Aragon could be induced, if circumstances were right, to participate in an invasion of Guienne, it was less from them than from one of the most powerful noblemen of southern France, Jean V, Count of Armagnac, that Edward was counting on getting a promise of active assistance.

It seems to have been towards the end of October, 1468, when Scales and Mountjoy were ready to set sail, that Edward sent one John Boon of Dartmouth to "the Earl of Armynac" with some letters[2] which apparently invited Jean V to support an English invasion of Guienne. And according to a deposition obtained from Boon a year later, Jean, after reading the letters, not only declared that the king of England had a right to Guienne, but promised to serve him with fifteen thousand men if he came to claim the duchy, said the king of Castile would help also, and even wrote a letter to Edward in which he addressed him as his sovereign lord. This story may not be altogether reliable, as Boon was an "untrue man," which seems to mean in this instance a hireling of the Earl of Warwick, and made his deposition under the eye of the king of France, to whom he went, after he had fulfilled his mission to the Count of Armagnac, and "discovered" the letters Edward had intrusted to him. But that Edward sent Boon to the Count of Armagnac there is no doubt. The only question is about the nature of the count's reply. Boon remained in Louis' service for a year or two, but in the end he fell into disfavour, either because the king distrusted him or, there is some reason to think, took a fancy to his wife. When Louis ordered his eyes put out, he fled, was captured by one of his fellow townsmen, John White of Dartmouth, and, though he offered two thousand scutes for his freedom, was carried to King Edward. What kind of a reception the rascal received from Edward is not recorded, but he had no cause to remember the king of France with affection, and years later, when Edward and Louis and Jean V were all in their graves, he made a confession in which he stated that what the Count of Armagnac really did, when he went to him with the king of England's letters, was to refuse either to receive him or to open the letters, and that the count's alleged promise to Edward was a fabrication by Louis himself, who hated and feared Jean and wanted to make an excuse for taking strong measures against him. According to this later story, Boon had been secretly charged by the Earl of Warwick to go to the French king, after he had delivered Edward's letters to Jean, and inform him of the whole matter, and Louis, after reading the letters which Jean had declined to open, wrote a reply in the count's name and sent it to Edward.[1]

---

[1] Rymer, XI, 631-635. On 21st October John wrote a friendly letter to Edward in reply to one Edward had sent to him by the hands of Vincent Clement. Calmette, 542. Clement was sent abroad again at the beginning of February, and before the end of that month a league was signed between John of Aragon and the Duke of Burgundy. Writs of Privy Seal, file 824, no. 2727; Calmette, 292.

[2] Issue Roll, Mich. 8 Edw. IV, 21st October.

Whatever may be the truth about the Count of Armagnac's attitude towards Edward's pretensions to Guienne, at the beginning of November it was reported that the English had landed somewhere in Languedoc, and Louis sent an army southward.[2] Fortunately for Louis, however, and very likely thanks to him, Edward himself at this moment experienced a fright, as from some source came a rumour that Margaret of Anjou and her son were at Harfleur with an army and were about to invade England. Consequently, when Scales and Mountjoy weighed anchor, about 25th October, their orders were not to sail for Guienne, but to intercept Margaret; and as Margaret was not in reality at Harfleur and was not preparing to invade England, glad as she would have been to do so, all that the fleet did was to cruise about rather aimlessly for several weeks. The Duke of Milan's ambassador wrote at one time that the English were "scouring the sea and landing first in one place and then in another" on the French coast, but according to the English chroniclers, Scales and Mountjoy landed nowhere, encountered no enemy except heavy storms, and about the end of November returned most ingloriously to the Isle of Wight.[3] William of Worcester declares that this expedition cost the king eighteen thousand pounds, and the records of the Exchequer go far to bear out his statement.[4] This money, however, was not altogether thrown away if, as there is some reason to think, the appearance of the ships that were hunting for Margaret of Anjou served to scare the French intruders in Jersey for whose presence there Margaret was responsible.

---

[1] Samaran, La maison d'Armagnac au XV^{e} siècle, 164, notes 2 and 3, 165-172, 412-420; Writs of Privy Seal, file 834, no. 3228—a safeconduct for two merchant ships granted to John White, the captor of Boon, on 12th July, 1471. Cf. Commynes-Lenglet, III, 145-150, 301-302.

[2] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 127.

[3] Worcester, 792; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 182.

[4] See the Issue Rolls and Warrants for Issues, 8 Edw. IV, 26th Oct. and 28th Nov.

The Castle of Mount Orgueil had been in the custody of Jean Carbonnel, Seigneur de Sourdeval, ever since the day in 1461 when he had taken possession of it in the name of Pierre de Brezé; for after the seneschal of Normandy fell at Montlhéri and Charles of France was made Duke of Normandy, Carbonnel had recognized Charles's overlordship and had been continued in command by him. When Louis took the duchy of Normandy from his brother, Carbonnel must have thought of surrendering to the English, as on 10th April, 1466, Edward granted a safeconduct for him, his son Henry, and Richard de Thieuville;[1] but in the end, apparently because he hoped to get Jersey for himself, he refused to deliver Mount Orgueil either to Edward or to Louis. Brezé's son exhorted him to enter the service of the king of France, who sent promises of reward, but he turned a deaf ear to the invitation. Instead of deserting the Duke of Normandy, he sent Richard de Thieuville to him to say that he would deliver the castle only to him, and afterwards both he and the garrison of Mount Orgueil wrote letters to the duke, assuring him that they would guard the castle "envers et contre tous" and live and die in his service. But the garrison seasoned its kind letter with a petition to Charles to send aid if the castle should be besieged, while Carbonnel asked for a grant of Jersey and Mount Orgueil in case Charles recovered his duchy. To these letters Charles wrote a grateful reply, declaring that he would never fail the brave garrison of Mount Orgueil and promising that, if he ever regained his duchy or if "Dieu nous donne de plus grans biens," he would give Jersey and Mount Orgueil to his faithful lieutenant and none other;[2] but he never got possession of the duchy of Normandy again or sent any considerable help to Carbonnel, and had the brave Philip de Carteret, who had resisted the French to the utmost, received the proper amount of assistance from England, no doubt the invaders could have been driven out with ease. Edward, however, being occupied with more important matters, seems to have given little thought to Jersey, and when he did think of it, his relations with the Duke of Brittany, the Duke of Normandy's host, may have deterred him from interfering with Carbonnel. Yet the fleet sent out in the spring of 1468 touched at the island, and two of its captains, Richard Harleston and Edmund Weston, stayed there to assist Carteret in his siege of Mount Orgueil.[1] Two ships of Fowey served twenty weeks in Jersey "in recovering of the same isle and the Castle Gurry within the same," and a third twenty-two weeks; and though it might be inferred from the *Chroniques de Jersey* that Harleston (Weston is not mentioned) acted on his own responsibility, without the king's knowledge or sanction, as a matter of fact Edward must have been well informed about all that was transpiring in Jersey, as three times one Thomas Dobney was sent to the island with letters to Harleston and Weston, "our captains lying at the siege of the same Isle, and to all the whole fellowship with them."[2] Nevertheless, Carbonnel was not dislodged, and finally, on 23rd September, when Scales and Mountjoy were expecting to sail in a few days, "the Isle of Jarsey, otherwise called Jerresey," was granted to Lord Scales and his heirs male, only reserving to the king "the superiority of the same in as large and like force as it hath been in any of the days of our noble progenitors when it hath been by any of them in form aforesaid or otherwise been given out."[3]

---

[1] French Roll 6 Edw. IV, m. 9.

[2] All of these letters are preserved in Dupuy MS. 762, ff. 111-114. They have been printed by Champollion-Figeac, Documents historiques inédits (Paris, 1843), Vol. II, pp. 449-455. Cf. Stein, Charles de France (Paris, 1921), pp. 212-215.

There must have been some reason for granting Jersey to Scales at this particular moment, and though there is no direct evidence that he and Mountjoy stopped at Jersey during their cruise, it is a fact that Mount Orgueil surrendered about that time. Even if Scales gave some help, however, the credit for the capture of Mount Orgueil was felt to belong to Harleston and the people of Jersey, and on 28th January, 1469, the islanders were granted a confirmation of their ancient charter, with the addition of some new privileges, in consideration of what they had suffered for the safety of the island and the reduction of Mount Orgueil, while Harleston was eventually made captain of the isle and castle with the right of taking such fees from the revenues as the faithless, or at least negligent, John Nanfant had once received.[1]

---

[1] Issue Roll, Easter 8 Edw. IV, 13th July.

[2] Warrants for Issues, 8 Edw. IV, 9th and 14th Dec., and 9 Edw. IV, 5th July. Dobney had to wait long for full pay for his services. See Warrants for Issues, 16 Edw. IV, 9th Feb.

[3] Writs of Privy Seal, file 821, no. 2555. This grant to Scales may have been made contingent on his success in taking Mount Orgueil, as the king's writ was not delivered to the chancellor until 25th November, by which time the castle had probably fallen and Scales had returned to England. There is no record of the grant either on the French Rolls or on the Patent Rolls.

After the capture of Mount Orgueil, which followed close upon the fall of Harlech, Edward IV could say that he ruled over every inch of territory over which Henry VI had been ruling on the day the crown was taken from him, with the exception of Berwick, that treasure of the northern border which Margaret of Anjou had given to the Scots, as she had given the Channel Isles to Brezé. But after all, Edward had little to exult over, in as much as his plans with regard to France had suffered such sad shipwreck and as every day signs of the existence of some plot against his throne seemed to multiply. The stories of Cornelius and Hawkins were still fresh in the memory when it was discovered that Margaret of Anjou had been sending more letters to friends in England, this time by the agency of Richard Steres, a London skinner who, back in 1460, while the Earls of March, Warwick, and Salisbury were waiting for the coming of the Duke of York from Ireland, had had to go before the common council of London and clear himself of a charge of plotting to murder the Earl of Warwick.[2] So again many men were sent to prison, and this time the arrests did not stop with London aldermen and merchants.

The first persons on whom the king's suspicion fixed this time were Sir Thomas Hungerford, son and heir of the Lord Hungerford beheaded after the battle of Hexham, and Henry Courtenay, heir to the earldom of Devonshire; and before 11th November both these men were taken into custody somewhere in Wiltshire and imprisoned at Salisbury.[3] After that came an even more startling arrest. There is no evidence that the Earl of Oxford had been suspected of having a share in the plot, if plot there really was, which had led to so many arrests in June, and though he had sought a pardon after the offer of amnesty made by the king in July,[4] that was no more than many an innocent man had thought best to do. But Edward, short as his memory usually was in such matters, had not forgotten that Oxford's father and brother had paid with their lives for treasonable intercourse with Margaret of Anjou, and when, about this time, the earl married Warwick's sister Margaret,[1] perhaps the king's confidence in him was not increased thereby. At all events, Oxford was arrested soon after Hungerford and Courtenay, thrust into the Tower, where his father and brother had spent their last hours, and according to report, put into irons. However, if the earl's imprisonment was harsh, it was not of long duration; for whether it was true or not that Aubrey de Vere had turned king's evidence in 1462, certainly his brother now did. By confessing "much thing" Oxford recovered his liberty and probably saved his head, though, it is to be feared, at the expense of two other lives. It had not escaped the knowledge of those who accompanied Margaret of York on her wedding journey that the Duke of Burgundy had sent away the Duke of Somerset only just in time to prevent them from finding him in Bruges, and now, through Oxford's confession, apparently, it was learned that two young men who had gone to Bruges in the train of the Duchess of Norfolk, John Poynings and William Alford, had held "familiar communication" with Somerset during their stay in Flanders. While the June arrests had resulted in two hangings at Tyburn, the November ones resulted in three beheadings on Tower Hill. Poynings and Alford and the skinner Steres were all executed on 28th November.[2]

---

[1] French Roll 16 Edw. IV, m. 3, 13th Jan., 1477; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 124, III, 40. The grant made to Harleston in 1477 was probably a renewal of an earlier one, as the author of the *Chroniques de Jersey*, who, however, makes the relief of Jersey occur in 1463 instead of in 1468, says that Harleston was captain of the island about sixteen years. After the death of Richard III, Harleston tried to make himself independent lord of Jersey but was attacked by Edmund Weston, the man who had helped him in 1468 to reduce Mount Orgueil, and finally driven to retire to Flanders, where he died in the service of Margaret of York. Le Quesne, Cons. Hist. of Jersey, chap. VIII.

[2] Rolls of Parl., VI, 292; London Journal 6, f. 265.

[3] Hist. MSS. Com., Various Collections, IV, 206-207.

[4] Pardon Roll 8-9 Edw. IV, m. 36.

The Tower Hill tragedy was not the end. Already yeomen of the crown had "ridden into divers counties to arrest men that be apeached," and the day after the execution of Poynings, Alford, and Steres still another sensational arrest was made. This time it was Thomas Tresham, Speaker of the parliament of 1459 which had attainted the Yorkists, who was thrust into the Tower. Tresham, too, according to a letter written at the moment of his arrest, came to grief through Oxford's confession, and "they say his livelihood and Sir John Marney's livelihood, and divers other livelihoods is given away by the king."[3] But if Tresham lost only his livelihood, he had reason to rejoice; for that was light punishment in comparision with the one meted out to Hungerford and Courtenay, whose trial was put off until 16th January, apparently because the king wanted to be present when the verdict was pronounced and could not go to Salisbury until after the New Year. When brought before their judges, both Hungerford and Courtenay asserted their innocence and Courtenay produced a pardon which had been granted to him in July but which proved to be worthless, as it covered only offences committed before 15th April, whereas the specific charge against him, and against Hungerford also, was that he had conspired on 21st May, as well as on other occasions before and after that date, to assist Margaret of Anjou to invade England and seize the crown for her husband or her son. The two noblemen were sentenced to be drawn through the streets of Salisbury and out to the gallows at Bemerton, there to be hanged, disembowelled, beheaded, and quartered. Hungerford suffered on 18th January and Courtenay probably on the same day.[1] It was said at the time that Lord Stafford of Southwick, one of the commissioners before whom the prisoners had been tried, "was cause of the said Harry Courtenay's death, for he would be Earl of Devonshire." And it is a fact that Stafford was given the earldom of Devonshire four months later.[2]

---

[1] Dugdale, I, 198.

[2] Plumpton Correspondence, 19-20; Hearne's Fragment, 297; Gregory, 237. Both Fabyan and Kingsford's London Chronicle state that Poynings and Alford were taken to Tyburn to be hanged but were pardoned at the last moment. Perhaps the writers had in mind the earlier case of Peter Alfray.

[3] Plumpton Correspondence, *ut sup.*

After the heads of Hungerford and Courtenay had fallen, the king went back to Westminster,[3] and for a time quiet seemed to reign. The queen was enceinte again, and in anticipation of her delivery the yeomen of her beds expended £54 18*s.* for various necessaries, such as a featherbed with a bolster, cushions, crocheted fringe, and many ells of fustian, holland cloth, crimson damask, crimson ingrain, and "reynes."[4] But again Edward's hope of an heir was disappointed. On 20th March the queen gave birth to "a very handsome daughter, which rejoiced the king and all the nobles exceedingly, though they would have preferred a son." Two barrels of hippocras and a pipe of Gascon wine were "delivered into the king's cellar" for the christening, and the new princess was endowed with her paternal grandmother's name, Cecily.[1]

---

[1] Rolls of Parl., VI, 305-307; Inquisitions *post mortem*, 8 Edw. IV, no. 43.

[2] Warkworth, 6; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 156.

[3] Privy Seals.

[4] See in Warrants for Issues, 9 Edw. IV, a document containing lists of articles delivered to John Shukburgh, yeoman of the king's (chamber ?) against Christmas, 8 Edw. IV, and for "the king's Maundy now last, anno ix°." By "reynes" is probably meant the fine linen manufactured at Rennes in Brittany.

Not for long, however, could the king let his mind dwell on pleasant domestic events such as the birth and christening of a new daughter. The imprisonment and execution of a few men might serve as a salutary lesson to those Englishmen who still remembered Henry VI with too much affection, but it could not be expected to put a stop to the efforts of Margaret of Anjou, especially if, as there was reason to suspect, she was being encouraged in whatever she was trying to do by the king of France. If without Louis' help Margaret could do little, with his help she might do much, and on that account it was with pleasure and relief that Edward had recently hailed the news that Jean de Rouville had arrived in his kingdom once more. Although after Francis's capitulation to Louis at Ancenis neither Edward nor Charles ever put much faith in him again, Edward, instead of breaking off all relations with the duke, had retained the Bastard of Brittany in his service, letting him go to sea with Scales and Mountjoy,[2] and had waited for the moment when Francis's fear of Louis would drive him back into the arms of his old allies. And now, just when Edward's anxiety about Margaret of Anjou's designs was growing acute, that moment had come. Jean de Rouville brought with him a peace-offering of a thousand pounds—probably all that Francis could pay at the moment, or all that he thought he ought to be asked to pay, towards the expense of fitting out Mountjoy's abortive expedition—and on 23rd March Edward promised again to defend Francis's duchy in case of need, while he rewarded Rouville himself for the "hearty diligence" he had shown "in the matters betwixt us and our cousin, the Duke of Bretaigne," with a license to export from England four thousand pounds of lead "for the covering of certain his building in Bretaigne."[3]

Jean de Rouville was not the only foreign envoy who was in England in March, 1469. The only definite information we have about the date of Princess Cecily's birth is derived from the letters of one Luchino Dallaghiexia of Milan, who was in London when she was born and who took considerable interest not only in that event, but in the arrival of a succession of ambassadors at the English court. First came an envoy from the king of Naples, though for what purpose Dallaghiexia could not find out. "It is true," he wrote, "that some of our merchants say that he has come to obtain that no alum except that of his master's shall be brought to this island, but I believe he has come for a greater matter, as he has taken a house and professes that he means to stay some months." Then, on 5th April, appeared three ambassadors from the Duke of Burgundy who, in the opinion of some persons, had come "because the bickering between the king of France and the duke should finish and because he wants to strengthen him with the king here," while others said they had come "to make peace between the king of France and the king here and that ambassadors from the king of France will shortly arrive."[1]

---

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 129; Warrants for Issues, *ut sup.*

[2] Warrants for Issues, 8 Edw. IV, 26th Oct., and 9 Edw. IV, 22nd Dec.; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 185.

[3] Receipt Roll, Mich. 8 Edw. IV, 29th March; Writs of Privy Seal, file 826, no. 2841; Dupuy, I, 229.

The Neapolitan ambassador did stay in London several months, but Dallaghiexia's curiosity concerning his errand was never satisfied, and the English records tell nothing except that to a certain bishop of Naples the king gave jewels worth £32 2*s.* and to a certain knight of Naples a gold collar of the royal livery.[2] About the Duke of Burgundy's embassy, on the other hand, Dallaghiexia ought to have been able to learn a good deal, as there was no secret about the purpose for which it had been sent. He might have learned, for one thing, that it was a belated embassy, as a safeconduct had been granted for it as far back as September.[3] In the second place, it was composed of Jean, Seigneur de Créquy, an aged knight who had worn the collar of the Golden Fleece since the day Philip of Burgundy founded that Order, Martin van Steenberghe, Dean of Brussels and registrar of the Order of the Golden Fleece, Pedro Vasques de Saavedra, a valiant Castilian knight who had been Philip of Burgundy's chamberlain and who had accompanied the Bastard of Burgundy to England at the time of the Smithfield tournament, and Jean de Halwin, the companion of the Seigneur de la Gruthuyse on his journey to Scotland in 1460 and now president of Holland.[4] In the third place, Charles had sent it to announce to Edward that he had been made a knight of the Golden Fleece. This news cannot have come as a surprise to Edward, since his election had taken place a year before; but that did not lessen his gratitude. Whatever gifts Créquy and Steenberghe got, Pedro de Vasques was presented with a gold collar, a gold cup, and twenty pounds in money, and Halwin with twenty pounds in money and jewels which cost the king £32 8*s.*[1] More than that, on 13th May Charles was repaid in kind by being made a knight of the Garter; and with such speed did Clarenceux Herald carry the Garter and a scarlet mantle trimmed with minever and ermine to Burgundy that as early as 30th May it was reported in France that Charles had been seen with the Garter on his leg.[2]

---

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 128.
[2] *Ibid.*, I, 132; Issue Roll, Easter 9 Edw. IV, 8th May.
[3] Writs of Privy Seal, file 820, no. 2549, 8th Sept.
[4] Chron. of John Stone, 107-108; Waurin, II, 51, note 1, 394-395; Reiffenberg, 4, 37-38, 40.

It was not, however, just to notify Edward that Charles had honoured him with the Golden Fleece that the Seigneur de Créquy and his fellow ambassadors had been sent to England. They had other missions to perform as well, though to try to arrange a peace between the kings of France and England was not one of them. Much more likely is it that they were to talk over new plans for Louis' overthrow, as they asked permission for the Duke of Normandy, whom Charles preferred to have at his own side instead of at that of the Duke of Brittany, to pass through England on his way to Burgundy. On 6th May Edward granted a safeconduct for "the brother of our adversary of France" and a retinue of five hundred persons[3]—a safeconduct which would probably have plunged Louis into new troubles had it not happened that, just before it was granted, he had placated his brother by giving him the duchy of Guienne in lieu of the duchy of Normandy.

One of the other tasks Charles had intrusted to his ambassadors was to make the final arrangements for the twofold diet of English and Burgundian ambassadors and merchants which was to have met at Bruges, Calais, or St. Omer on 20th January, but before this time, owing, it is safe to say, to no fault of the king of England, had been postponed until 12th May. On 1st May Edward named the Bishop of Rochester, Wenlock, Scott, Hatclyf, and others to go to Bruges as his ambassadors and seventeen merchants, including John Prout, mayor of the staple of Calais, and William Caxton, to act as the representatives of the merchants of England.

---

[1] Issue Roll, Easter 9 Edw. IV, 2nd and 8th May.

[2] Commynes-Lenglet, III, 99-101; Reiffenberg, 62; Issue Roll, Easter 9 Edw. IV, 2nd May; Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 130. The Garter sent to Charles was made by John Brown of London and cost £8 6*s.* 8*d.* The scarlet mantle cost £14 13*s.* 4*d.*

[3] Rymer, XI, 644.

So anxious was he that nothing should hinder the diet this time that he gave orders that Wenlock, Scott, Prout, Caxton, and two more merchants who were already on the other side of the sea were to act alone in case contrary winds or any such mischance prevented the other ambassadors and merchants from reaching Bruges by the appointed day.[1] Yet immediately after, the diet was postponed a little longer, until 1st June, as it was decided to hold a monetary conference in connection with it and this made necessary some further planning and the issuance of new commissions.[2]

Edward's ambassadors left London on 19th May, and in order to fulfil his promise to send an embassy to Bruges to negotiate with the Hanseatic League, the king gave them authority to treat with the Hanse towns as well as with the Duke of Burgundy.[3] But though the Bishop of Rochester did not see London again until 19th August and Hatclyf not until 12th November, while Scott remained abroad for the "speeding" of certain matters with the Duke of Burgundy until 10th February, 1470, it was little that any of them accomplished. On 23rd August the monetary conference arrived at an agreement fixing the par of exchange for all coins in legal circulation in England and the Netherlands,[4] but no progress was made towards any new plan to chastise or circumvent the king of France, and once more Charles found some excuse for refusing to "enlarge" English cloth. Even the attempt to reach an understanding with the Hanse towns came to nothing, in fact, to worse than nothing. The Hansards of Bruges, to whom the Hanse towns had delegated the task of negotiating with Edward's ambassadors, offered to accept a year's truce with England if the Duke of Burgundy wished them to do so, but they would do this, they said, only on condition that the London Hansards were compensated for their losses or at least were given back the goods that had been taken from them. On this condition they were also willing to hold a diet with the English in some continental town, but they insisted that Edward must be ready to treat not only for peace, but for the redress of injuries of old date as well as recent; and knowing England's feeling about the Burgundian edict against English cloth, they threatened that they too would forbid the importation of English cloth if their demands were refused and would recall all their merchants from London. The Duke of Burgundy tried to mediate, but it was hopeless, as the negotiations did not begin until about the middle of June and by that time the English ambassadors were so worried by a report that a disturbance, of which there had been some signs even before they left home, seemed likely to develop into a serious rebellion that they were afraid to promise anything or to commit themselves in any way. It was suggested that the negotiations might be resumed later, after quiet had been restored in England, but the Hansards again named conditions to which the Englishmen would not consent, and the outcome of the whole matter was that, while the merchants of Cologne—at the cost of expulsion from the Hanseatic League for their selfishness and disloyalty—remained in England and continued to enjoy the ancient privileges of the members of the *Guildhalla Teutonicorum*, all relations between England and the other Hanse towns were broken off.[1] It was not until August, 1470, that the Hanseatic League, whose unwieldy organization and internal differences always made concerted action difficult and slow, issued a decree forbidding commerce with England and the importation of English cloth and other English merchandise; but in the meantime English merchants had already ceased to "repair and resort unto the land of Pruce and other places of the Hanse" and all Hanseatic merchants, except those of Cologne, had departed from England to return no more.[2]

---

[1] Signed Bills, file 1500, no. 4290, 1st May; Writs of Privy Seal, file 826, no. 2815, 5th May; French Roll 9 Edw. IV, m. 13, 6th May.

[2] Writs of Privy Seal, file 826, no. 2837; French Roll 9 Edw. IV, m. 12, 17, 18; Diplomatic Documents (Exchequer T. of R.), box 36, no. 1073. Edward added to his commissioners Hugh Bryce, who, as keeper of the exchange in London and one of the governors of the mint at the Tower, would be a specially serviceable person at the monetary conference. £13 6*s.* 8*d.* were paid to Ralph Tikyll for accompanying Bryce and others beyond the sea to examine into the value of the money in circulation in the domains of the Duke of Burgundy. Issue Roll, Easter 9 Edw. IV, 18th May.

[3] Warrants for Issues, 9 Edw. IV, 13th Dec. and 11 Edw. IV, 15th July—warrants for paying Rotheram, Hatclyf, and Scott for this embassy; Rymer, XI, 645.

[4] A. de Witte, Conférence monétaire internationale tenue à Bruges en 1469.

Edward had not bargained for war when he arrested the Hanseatic merchants in London, but certainly the blame for what had happened rested with him and not with the ambassadors he had sent to Bruges. For how could those ambassadors make promises in his name when England was topsy-turvy and they had reason to fear that he was no longer a free agent?

---

[1] Hanserecesse, II, 6, pp. 155-156, 190-199, 212. On 18th July Edward assured to the Cologne merchants all the privileges of the *Guildhalla Teutonicorum* by a grant which at first extended only until Easter, 1470, but which was afterwards continued from time to time. French Rolls, 9 Edw. IV, m. 18, 10 Edw. IV, m. 10, and 49 Hen. VI, m. 3; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 237, 272, 307, 387.

[2] Hanserecesse, II, 6, pp. 339-347; Rolls of Parl., VI, 65. For a time the town of Dinant, which had suffered very severely at the hands of the Duke of Burgundy, was permitted by the League to export goods from England. Hanserecesse, II, 6, p. 297.

In the spring Warwick, who now seemed to have resigned himself to what he had struggled in vain to alter, had been engaged in fitting out a fleet "for the safe custody of the sea," and about the time the Seigneur de Créquy arrived in England, he had gone over to Calais, probably to carry out a commission which had been given to him, with Wenlock, Whetehill, and others, to determine the boundaries of the pale.[1] Just at that time, as it happened, the Duke of Burgundy was receiving the momentous visit from the Emperor's cousin, Sigismund, Count of Tyrol and Archduke of Austria, during which a marriage between Mary of Burgundy and the Emperor's son, Maximilian, was first proposed and Sigismund mortgaged a part of his hereditary lands to Charles for a large sum of money and a promise of protection against the Swiss; and on 21st April Warwick rode over to Ardres to see Charles and his guest. On this occasion the earl's stay was brief, but five days later, with a large company, he went to St. Omer to meet Charles and Sigismund again, and afterwards, accompanied by Charles, to Aire to pay his respects to the Duchess Margaret, whom he had last seen as she sailed away from Margate for her marriage. From Aire he returned to Calais and immediately after, apparently, to England, as he seems to have been present when Charles was elected to the Order of the Garter on 13th May.[2] Short as his absence had been, however, he was greeted on his return with the news that there had been serious happenings while he was away and that his brother Northumberland had been given opportunity to render a new service to the house of York. For some time past there had been signs of trouble in the north, where one Robin of Redesdale, or Robin Mendall,[3] was gathering a dangerous number of malcontents about him, just as another, or this same, Robin had gathered men about him the year before. There is reason to believe that Robin of Redesdale was no less a person than Sir John Conyers of Hornby, the husband of Warwick's and Northumberland's cousin, Alice, youngest daughter of the late Earl of Kent, and yet Northumberland, at the king's call, had collected an army, marched against the insurgents about 26th April, and in a week's time or a little more succeeded in scattering them.[1]

---

[1] Rymer, XI, 641.

[2] Waurin, II, 401-402; Commynes-Lenglet, II, 193. "R. Wasselbik" in the document printed in Commynes-Lenglet, III, 99-101, is probably a misreading for "R. Warwick."

[3] Perhaps a nickname, "mend all."

It may have been with mixed feelings that Warwick listened to the story of what his brother had been doing in his absence; but if his sympathies were with Robin of Redesdale, he hid the fact with entire success and, after his return, seemed to devote himself to the king's service on the sea with as much zeal as his brother had just displayed in the same service on land. On 22nd May Sir John Paston was told that "my Lord of Warwick's ships goeth to the sea,"[2] and on the 30th Sforza di' Bettini, now the Duke of Milan's ambassador in France, wrote of an alarm. The French had discovered at sea, Bettini wrote, about thirty English ships, some of which steered towards Bordeaux and Bayonne and landed some two thousand Englishmen at various places along the coast. These Englishmen, he said, claimed to be merchants, and they had brought some merchandise with them, but when the admiral of France arrested them by the king's order, it was found, "from what I hear," that they were expecting a great English fleet to come and take Bordeaux and Bayonne. Later on, he stated, the English fleet actually appeared with, according to report, twenty-five thousand men or thereabouts. "And it is said that they have occasionally come on shore, and some of them have penetrated close up to Noyon, taking some prisoners for ransom, among others they took near Noyon the barber of the grand constable of France. They pass through the territory of the Duke of Burgundy, as they cannot reach as far as Noyon by any other way. . . . This proceeding of the Duke of Burgundy has not created too good an impression, as there is no doubt whatever that, unless he had some hand in the affair, the English could not have penetrated so far as they did."

The story of the doings of the English fleet as told by the Milanese ambassador was certainly only partly true, but on 8th June he mentioned the fleet again. Ten of the arrested Englishmen, he said, had been brought before the king and had tried to justify themselves, but he thought they would not get off scot free unless some agreement was made between the kings of France and England, and that seemed unlikely to happen, "as it is certain that the English fleet is at sea and frequently shows itself off the coast by Bordeaux and Bayonne, threatening a landing, although none has taken place yet." About three weeks later his news was that for some days past the English fleet had not "appeared off Bordeaux and Bayonne as it did before," and he added a piece of information which suggests why Louis was so much disturbed. "At present," he said, "the charge of those districts belongs to the Duke of Guienne."[1]

---

[1] Warkworth, 6; Abbreviata Cronica (edited by J. J. Smith, Cambridge, 1840), 13; Hist. MSS. Com., Beverley Corporation MSS., 144; Ramsay, II, 338; Dugdale, I, 309. The Beverley men who went with Northumberland "pro repressione Hob. de Redesdale et aliorum inimicorum Domini Regis" left home on the morrow of St. Mark's Day and were absent nine days.

[2] Paston Letters, V, 28. Payments to Warwick for the fleet are entered on Issue Roll, Easter 9 Edw. IV, 20th April, 18th May.

But in reality Louis had nothing to fear from the English fleet, both because it was commanded, if not by Warwick himself, at least by men of Warwick's choosing, and because Edward was finding that he had a great deal to look after at home. Even before the fleet had put to sea, fresh disturbances had broken out in the north—in Lancashire, where Robin of Redesdale, in spite of his recent defeat by the Earl of Northumberland, was busy again, and in Yorkshire, where still another Robin, who called himself Robin of Holderness and who seems to have been a member of the Hilliard family, was stirring up trouble.[2]

As for Robin of Holderness and his followers, they sought, at the start, nothing but the removal of a local grievance, namely, the right which had been claimed for many years, even from the reign of King Athelstan, it was asserted, by St. Leonard's Hospital, an ancient almshouse of York, to exact a "thrave" of corn from every ploughland in Yorkshire, Lancashire, Westmoreland, and Cumberland. This tax, which was known as "petercorn," had long been resented by the farmers, but in spite of protests, the hospital's right to it had been confirmed by an act of parliament at the beginning of Henry VI's reign[3] and, still more recently, by a decree of Edward's own council. In the summer of 1468, upon complaint of the master and brethren of St. Leonard's that some persons of the West Thing of York had refused to pay the tax, Edward had summoned the "withholders" before him and, after the Earl of Warwick and the two chief justices had made an investigation, during which the master and brethren brought forth in defence of their claim many documents, including confirmations of it by all the kings of England from William the Conqueror down to Edward IV himself, proclamation had been made that every man who owned any "plough erand" within the four counties must pay the petercorn, unless he had compounded for it with the master and brethren of the hospital.[1] But no act of parliament or decree of the king's council could reconcile the farmers to this tax on their crops, and at last, at the call of Robin of Holderness, they had risen in arms. Unfortunately, however, for the success of their first and evidently just claim, the insurgents decided, when once they had risen, to make another demand. They demanded the restoration of the earldom of Northumberland to the heir of the Percies, who was still a prisoner in the Tower. And this spelled their undoing, as, at the first indication of danger to his earldom, Warwick's brother leapt into his saddle again, met the insurgents at the very gates of York, routed them, and beheaded their leader.[2]

---

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 129-130.

[2] Stow, 421, identifies Robin of Redesdale with Robert Hilliard. But see Ramsay, II, 339.

[3] Rolls of Parl., IV, 249-250.

For the second time within a few weeks the Earl of Northumberland had earned the king's gratitude by putting down an uprising in the north. But the second rising under Robin of Redesdale was to prove much less easy to overcome than his first one, or than the rising under Robin of Holderness, as in this instance the insurgents had powerful backing and a much more important object in view. To make matters worse, Edward was so far from understanding the true meaning of what was going on in the northern part of his kingdom that, though he finally decided to go to Lancashire himself, instead of calling on Northumberland to do his work for him a third time, he felt no need of haste and went about his preparations in a leisurely way. While his "wardrober" made ready "banners, standards, coat-armours, pensils for spears, forty jackets of velvet and of damask with roses, a thousand jackets of blue and murrey with roses, scutcheons, and such other stuff for the field as must needs be had at this time,"[3] he set out, on 5th or 6th June, with Gloucester, Rivers, Scales, Sir John Woodville, and other companions, to make a pilgrimage to the shrines of St. Edmund at Bury and of Our Lady of Walsingham and to raise the men who were to wear the blue and murrey jackets. On his way through Hertfordshire he stopped at The Moor, a manor which the Archbishop of York had "purchased and builded right commodiously and pleasantly," and secured from the archbishop a promise that, he would join him in the north as soon as possible. Then he rode on to Bury St. Edmund's and Norwich. By this time London was feeling so troubled about the state of the kingdom that, on 20th June, the master and wardens of the armourers' company were forbidden to send any arms out of the city without a license from the mayor;[1] but Edward, quite unconcerned, made his pilgrimage to Walsingham and then went to Croyland, where, after he had delighted the monks and the villagers by walking through the village streets and praising the houses and the bridge, he took boat for Fotheringay. The queen was waiting for him at Fotheringay, and he spent a week with her there during which more troops joined him and tents and artillery were sent on from London for his use;[2] but on 7th July he arrived at Grantham, and from there he seems to have pushed on at once to Newark. At Newark, however, he suddenly halted, turned his horse about, and rode back to Nottingham as fast as he could go.[3]

---

[1] Writs of Privy Seal, file 820, no. 2517, 30th July, 1468; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 131-132. For the history of St. Leonard's Hospital, see Drake, Eboracum, 332-337. George Neville was warden of the hospital from 1456 to 1458 and was succeeded by John Hals, afterwards Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield. Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, pp. 277, 470.

[2] Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 183; Vergil, 655.

[3] Warrants for Issues, 9 Edw. IV, 18th June.

Edward's hasty retreat from Newark was due in part to the discovery that Robin of Redesdale had a bigger army than he had, but in still larger measure, probably, to the receipt of a manifesto which professed to be an utterance of Robin of Redesdale and his followers but which, as he at once recognized, had been drawn up in accordance with Warwick's directions, if not actually by the earl's own hand.[4] Well might Edward be frightened as he read this manifesto, for in it he found himself classed with England's three deposed kings, Edward II, Richard II, and Henry VI, on the ground that he had excluded the lords of his blood from his council chamber and had listened only to the advice of grasping favourites, namely, Earl Rivers and his wife and sons, Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, Stafford, Earl of Devonshire, Lord Audley, Sir John Fogge, and others "of their mischievous assent and opinion." Through the influence of these favourites, his accusers asserted, he had been led to impoverish himself that their greed might be satisfied, to "change his most rich coin," to suffer the practice of maintenance, to spend the goods of the Pope which had been given to him for the defence of the Faith, to levy heavy and unjust taxes on his subjects, and to accuse of treason those men whom his favourites disliked, with the result that "no man of worship or riches, either spiritual or temporal," could be sure of his life or his property. To remedy all this the manifestants demanded that he should set aside enough "livelihood and possessions" to enable him, and his heirs after him, to live up to the promise he had made, "openly with his own mouth," in his last parliament not to tax his subjects except for urgent causes, that no one but his own "issue and his brethren" should be allowed to touch what was thus set aside for his maintenance, that the revenues from tunnage and poundage should be employed for the purpose for which those taxes were granted, namely, the keeping of the sea, and, lastly, that the laws and statutes which had been enacted to keep the land "in good health and peace" should be properly observed and executed.[1]

---

[1] London Journal 7, f. 195.

[2] Warrants for Issues, 9 Edw. IV, 30th June; Issue Roll, Easter 9 Edw. IV, 8th May; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 163.

[3] Privy Seals; Paston Letters, V, 28-33, 35; Hist. Croy. Cont., 542; Warkworth, 25.

[4] It is stated in Abbreviata Cronica, 13, that a copy of the manifesto was finally sent to the king.

As soon as he reached Nottingham, Edward hurried the Woodvilles off to places of safety—Rivers and Sir John Woodville to Wales and Scales to Norfolk[2]—and then, on 9th July, with his own hand he wrote letters to Clarence, Warwick, and the Archbishop of York in which, without indulging in any upbraidings, he asked all three of them to come to him as soon as possible and expressed the hope that Warwick was not "of any such disposition towards us as the rumour here runneth, considering the trust and affection we bear in you."[3] But though these letters were dispatched at once by the hands of Sir Thomas Montgomery and one Maurice Berkeley, they were too late to hold back the storm.

The day Edward had spent with the Archbishop of York at The Moor, Clarence had arrived at Canterbury followed by a large retinue, and two days later had gone to Sandwich to meet Warwick. As Clarence left Canterbury, the Archbishop of York arrived there, and soon after he, too, accompanied by the Bishop of London and the Prior of Christ Church, Canterbury, went to Sandwich. There was nothing strange about all this travelling to Sandwich, as Warwick had been having one of his ships, the

---

[1] Warkworth, 47-51; Chron. of the White Rose, 219-224.

[2] Hist. Croy. Cont., 542; Waurin, II, 404-406.

[3] Paston Letters, V, 35-36.

Trinity, rebuilt or refitted for the king's service, and it was to assist at the blessing of this ship that he and his friends were assembling. Yet a mother's intuition seems to have detected something wrong, for on 15th June, three days after the *Trinity* had been solemnly blessed by the Archbishop of York, the Duchess of York also arrived at Sandwich. But if the duchess came in the hope that she could prevent what she feared by reminding her son Clarence of his duty, her hope was disappointed. On the 21st Warwick and Clarence went up to Canterbury together and from there to Queenborough, and afterwards Warwick at least must have proceeded to London, as from there, on 28th June, he sent a letter to the town of Coventry in which, after boldly stating that he and "my lord, the Duke of Clarence," intended to join the king in the north "after the solemnization of the marriage by God's grace in short time to be had between my said lord and my daughter," he bade the town have a band of men ready to accompany him.[1] On 4th July, however, both the earl and the duke were at Canterbury again, with the Archbishop of York and the Earl of Oxford, and two days later, accompanied by the archbishop and probably Oxford as well, they crossed to Calais.[2]

As it chanced, almost the first person Warwick encountered at Calais was the chronicler, Jean de Waurin, who, being anxious, like all good historians, to collect "matières véritables" for his book, had managed to have some conversation with Warwick at the time of the earl's visit to St. Omer in April and had been rewarded with a promise that, if he would come to Calais, he should have not only good cheer, but all the historical information he desired. But the chronicler had chosen an inopportune moment to hold Warwick to his word, and although he spent nine days at Calais and the good cheer was not lacking, he was able to gather up little historical material. Warwick finally dismissed him with nothing better than a "belle haquenée" for a parting gift and an invitation to come again after a couple of months, and Waurin was shrewd enough to guess, as he reluctantly departed, that the reason the earl had no time to spare for him just then was that important history was at that moment in process of making at Calais.[3] Nor was his guess wrong; for within a few days after his departure, on 11th July, the Duke of Clarence was married at Calais to Warwick's daughter

[1] Coventry Leet Book, II, 342.
[2] Chron. of John Stone, 109-111.
[3] Waurin, II, 402.

Isabel, the dispensation for the marriage having been at last obtained from the Pope by Edward's own agent at Rome, James Goldwell, whom Clarence had apparently bribed.[1] The Archbishop of York performed the marriage ceremony in the presence of Warwick, "five other knights of the Garter, and many other lords and ladies and worshipful knights well accompanied with wise and discreet esquires in right great number"; and one half of the lands of her mother's vast inheritance was the dower which Isabel brought to her husband and which, perhaps coupled with a promise to procure his recognition as heir to his brother's throne, had tempted Clarence to play the traitor.[2]

At last Warwick had thrown off the mask that for the last four years had but half hidden his disloyalty. He had openly defied the king. And the marriage at Calais was only the first step. The day after the marriage an open letter, signed by Clarence and the Archbishop of York as well as by Warwick himself, was dispatched to England, along with copies of Robin of Redesdale's manifesto; and in that letter the writers stated that, as the king's true subjects in divers parts of his realm had delivered to them certain "bills of articles" setting forth "the deceivable covetous rule and guiding of certain seditious persons," to wit, Earl Rivers and his wife, the Earls of Pembroke and Devonshire, Lords Scales and Audley, Sir John Woodville and his brothers, Sir John Fogge, and others, and "with piteous lamentation" had called upon them and other lords to find a remedy, they were coming to lay a petition before the king. They intended, they said, to be at Canterbury on the coming Sunday, and they asked their friends to be ready to accompany them to the king with as many men as they could muster.[3]

If Warwick and his companions did not actually reach Canterbury on Sunday, 16th July, at least they seem to have been there by the following Tuesday, as on that day the Earl of Oxford wrote from there to Sir John Paston begging him to send him in haste

---

[1] See Rymer, XI, 638, and, in Vatican Transcripts, 62, a letter which Pope Paul II wrote to Clarence on 18th January, 1471, when sending Goldwell to England, and in which he says: "Venit modo cum certa commissione nostra isthuc dilectus filius Jacobus Goldewel notarius noster, vir quidem probus et modestus, et de te non parum benemeritus. Nam tum in ceteris sibi commissis negotiis, tum in tuis maxime in ea dispensatione matrimonii tue nobilitatis optime se gessit, semperque de te apud nos bene testatus est."

[2] Dugdale, I, 307; Waurin, II, 403; Ordinances for the Household of George, Duke of Clarence, in Ordinances and Regulations for the Government of the Royal Household, 98.

[3] Warkworth, 46-47; Chron. of the White Rose, 219.

"three horse harness as goodly as ye and Genyn can devise" and breathing the prayer, "I trust to God we shall do right well."[1] Warwick had been warden of the Cinque Ports for so many years that he had numerous friends and retainers in Kent, and as these men gladly answered his call,[2] Oxford's prayer seemed to be answered almost as soon as it was uttered. In London too, although most of the citizens of wealth were inclined to take Edward's part—if only because he owed them much money which they might never see again if misfortune overtook him—Warwick was well received. He even got a loan of a thousand pounds from the mayor and aldermen and a few other citizens before he departed to meet Robin of Redesdale, who was already moving southward to join forces with him.[3] Yet in spite of the speed with which he had advanced, Warwick was not destined to be in at the first killing. For a third army was marching across England, an army of Welshmen and west-country archers which the Earls of Pembroke and Devonshire had hurriedly gathered up and were leading to the king's assistance, and Robin of Redesdale determined not to let it pass. Robin was lucky enough to come up with the two earls just when, because of a silly quarrel about quarters in the town of Banbury, Pembroke was encamped on Danesmoor, in the parish of Edgecott, while Devonshire, who had all the archers with him, was sulking some ten or twelve miles away. The attack fell upon Pembroke, and though Devonshire hurried up as soon as he heard that fighting was going on, he was too late to save the battle. Despite the fact that Devonshire's absence left him without archers, Pembroke fought bravely and Robin lost many men, including his own son, James Conyers, Henry Neville, Lord Latimer's heir and a cousin of the Earl of Warwick, and Oliver Dudley, Lord Dudley's son. But the arrival of a small body of troops which Warwick had sent ahead under the command of a man named Clapham, gave the victory to Robin.[4] Pembroke and his brother, Sir Richard Herbert, "a gentle knight and a manly," were taken

[1] Paston Letters, IV, 300. Dr. Gairdner assigned the letter here cited to the year 1468, but there is little doubt that correctly it belongs to 1469. See Scofield, Eng. Hist. Review, April, 1914, p. 231.

[2] Waurin, *ut sup.*

[3] Chastellain, V, 485, 486, 499; Commynes, I, 217; London Journal 7, f. 198; Sharpe, I, 310. Cf. Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 133.

[4] Warkworth, 6-7; Hearne's Fragment, 300-301; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 183; Hist. Croy. Cont., 542-543; Ricart's Kalendar, 44; Arnold's Chron., xxxv; Waurin, II, 406-409 (details not reliable). Pembroke's death occurred on Thursday, 27th July. Inquisitions *post mortem*, 9-10 Edw. IV, no. 21.

and hurried to Northampton, where Warwick and Clarence had arrived by this time, and there were beheaded on the following day—not so quickly, however, but that Pembroke was able to write a letter to his wife. The chroniclers describe Edward's bosom friend as an oppressor and despoiler of the clergy whose death on the block, in the opinion of one of them, was a just punishment by God.[1] Yet in his parting message to his wife Herbert not only bade her remember her promise "to take the order of widowhood, as ye may be the better master of your own to perform my will and to help my children, as I love and trust you," but directed that certain gifts should be made to Tintern Abbey and to the priory of Abergavenny, where his body was to be buried, that certain priests should sing for his soul and for the souls of all persons who had fallen in battle during the past two years, and that "my almshouse" should be given enough endowment "to find six poor men and one to serve them." His last words were: "Wife, pray for me and take the said order that ye promised me, as ye had in my life my heart and love. God have mercy upon me and save you and our children, and Our Lady and all the Saints of Heaven help me to salvation. Amen."[2]

The victory of Edgecott, on 26th July, not only removed the Herberts; it also left the king at Warwick's mercy. Unaware of the disaster that had befallen Pembroke and Devonshire, whom he knew to be on their way from Wales, Edward started out from Nottingham, about 29th July,[3] to meet them, and he had gone as far as Olney when he was met with news of the battle and was thereupon deserted by his men. The Archbishop of York having been informed by someone that the king was near and almost alone, Warwick sent him, "with certain horsemen harnessed," to Olney, and although all the forms of royalty were kept up as carefully as they had been when Henry VI was taken captive at St. Albans and at Northampton, Edward found himself a prisoner. Whether he would or no, he had to go to Coventry and, a few days later, to Warwick Castle.[4] In the meantime, too, the rest of his friends were being hunted down. Lord Scales succeeded in escaping capture, but Earl Rivers and Sir John Woodville were taken either at Chepstow or in the forest of Dean and were beheaded at Gosford Green, just outside of Coventry, on 12th August. About the same time Thomas Herbert was put to death at Bristol, and on 17th August the Earl of Devonshire, who had fled after the battle of Edgecott, was taken and beheaded by the "commons" at Bridgewater in Somersetshire.[1] Queen Elizabeth, who had gone back to London after the king left Fotheringay, was permitted to remain there, keeping "scant state" but safe and unmolested,[2] but her mother, who had been specially mentioned in Robin of Redesdale's manifesto, was not so fortunate. The Dowager Duchess of Bedford was seized by one Thomas Wake, a Northamptonshire man who had lost a son in the battle of Edgecott,[3] and he, after spreading a rumour that the duchess had employed the popular device of leaden images both to bring about the marriage of her daughter with the king and to compass the Earl of Warwick's destruction, sent to the king's custodians at Warwick Castle an image, "made like a man-of-arms, containing the length of a man's finger and broken in the midst and made fast with a wire," which he claimed the duchess had made. Jacquetta de Luxembourg, however, was not a person who would submit tamely to insult or give up in despair at the sight of danger. She appealed for protection to the mayor and aldermen of London, and though they looked at her letter a little suspiciously, as Wake himself was the bearer of it, and took the precaution of sending it to the Duke of Clarence, they remembered the duchess's kind services to their city after the battle of St. Albans, when she was sent to treat with Margaret of Anjou, and decided to take up her cause with the lords of the king's council.[4] Ultimately certain persons were appointed to examine Wake, and also a parish clerk whom Wake had tried to induce to testify that he knew of two other images of the duchess's making, one representing the king and the other her daughter; but as the parish clerk refused, when it came to the point, to say what Wake wanted him to say, the whole case against the duchess had to be dismissed, and in the following February, when the king was his own master again and there was a meeting of the great council, she succeeded in having the depositions of Wake and the parish clerk laid before the council. Then, after she had made a declaration that she had always believed "on God according to the truth of Holy Church," she was cleared of all "noises and disslanders" against her.[1]

---

[1] Three Fif. Cent. Chron. Cf. some annals of Gloucester Abbey, Kingsford's Eng. Hist. Lit. in Fif. Cent., 356.

[2] Dugdale, II, 257; Nicolas, Testamenta Vetusta (London, 1826), I, 304.

[3] He wrote a letter to the town of Coventry from Nottingham on 29th July. Coventry Leet Book, II, 345.

[4] Warkworth, 7, 46; Hist. Croy. Cont., 543, 551; Stow, 422; Waurin, III, 2-4. The privy seals show that Edward was at Coventry on 2nd August and at Warwick Castle from 8th to 13th August.

---

[1] Coventry Leet Book, II, 346; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 183; Warkworth, 7; Hearne's Fragment, 301; Ricart's Kal., 44; Waurin, II, 406; Dugdale, I, 173; Reports touching Dignity of a Peer, V, 398; Inquisitions *post mortem*, 9-10 Edw. IV, no. 14.

[2] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 131-132. On 31st July the mayor and aldermen had voted to make the queen a gift of wine. London Journal 7, f. 198b.

[3] Warkworth.

[4] 31st August. London Journal 7, f. 199.

Thanks to the promptness and daring of his confederate, Robin of Redesdale, Warwick had won a victory more swift and complete than probably even he had deemed possible. The Herberts and the worst of the Woodvilles were now out of his way for ever, and Edward himself was his prisoner. But the position of a king's jailer is seldom a bed of roses, and Warwick's triumph was no sooner won than he found himself in difficulties. As Rivers's death necessitated the appointment of a new treasurer, Sir John Langstrother, Prior of St. John's, a well known opponent of the Woodvilles, was appointed to fill that office;[2] but no other changes were made in Edward's ministers. Warwick did not even make his brother chancellor again, as, indeed, he had no excuse for doing, since Stillington meekly accepted his handiwork. With the help of Rotheram, just returned from Bruges, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of London and Carlisle, Lords Mountjoy, Dynham, Dacre, and Ferrers, Sir John Howard, and other members of the king's council, Stillington remained in London trying to preserve order and to keep the wheels of government turning. But convenient as it was to have the council acquiesce in what he had done, Warwick had to have more backing than that. He must have the approval of parliament also, and on 8th August, "by the advice of our council," Edward gave orders for the issuance of writs for a parliament to meet at York on 22nd September, although Dallaghexia, who mentioned in one of his letters that it was the intention to hold a parliament to "arrange the government of the realm," added, "every one is of the opinion that it would be better not."[1] Soon after, between 13th and 25th August, perhaps because it was feared that someone would attempt to rescue him, Edward was removed by the Archbishop of York from Warwick to Middleham Castle,[2] another Neville stronghold and one at a safer distance from London, which by this time was displaying a spirit that was not the least of Warwick's troubles.

---

[1] Rolls of Parl., VI, 232; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 190.

[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 165. Edward had wanted the priory of St. John's for Sir Richard Woodville. Worcester, 791. Langstrother's election to the priorship was not confirmed by the Pope until 1st September, 1469 (Vatican Transcripts, 62), and even then Edward refused to recognize him until he had taken the oath of fealty. This Langstrother finally did on 18th November, but under protest, as there was no precedent for demanding such an oath, and Henry VI afterwards ordered the enrolment of the oath to be cancelled. Rymer, XI, 650. Cf. Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 189, 231.

London had received Warwick kindly, if not enthusiastically, when he came from Calais, but just what the earl meant to do probably no one had realized, and when the battle of Edgecott had been fought and it began to be suspected that the king was a prisoner, the mob rose in its might. The city was threatened with a reign of pillage and rapine which the king's councillors might have been unable to check had they not received help from an unexpected quarter. The Seigneur de Créquy and the other Burgundian ambassadors who had come to England in April had been detained in London owing to the need of modifying some of the statutes of the Order of the Golden Fleece before Edward could take the oath of the Order, and Créquy, if not his colleagues, had accompanied the king when he went north, but had been sent back to the city by Edward as soon as it became evident that there was going to be fighting. The presence of the Burgundian ambassadors in London proved of the greatest value, as they were recognised to be friends of the king, and their influence was strengthened by a letter which the Duke of Burgundy wrote to the city as soon as he heard of the battle of Edgecott and the plight Edward was in.[3] Charles promised the citizens help and protection if they were faithful to his brother-in-law and the Burgundian alliance, but threatened vengeance if they were not; and his words seem to have made an impression not only on the Londoners, who replied with good promises, but on Warwick himself, who, though he still felt about the alliance with Burgundy as he had always felt and had already dispatched an envoy to France to seek help from Louis,[4] could but be thankful for the steadying influence which the presence of the Burgundians exercised. In fact, so conscious was Warwick of what he owed to Charles's ambassadors that he allowed Edward to send orders for an extension of their safeconduct and also directed that proclamation should be made in London, Westminster, and Southwark that the king, by the advice of the lords of his council, straitly commanded that no person, on pain of imprisonment, fine, and forfeiture, should presume to make any "affray, congregations, assemblies, riots, or robberies" or to do or say anything to the breach of the peace, of the king's safeconduct, or of any amity, fellowship, or league which he had made with the Duke of Burgundy or any other foreign prince.[1]

---

[1] Writs of Privy Seal, file 827, no. 2875; Reports touching Dignity of a Peer, IV, 969-972; Cal. Milanese Papers, *ut sup.*

[2] Hist. Croy. Cont., 551; Privy Seals.

[3] MS. français 88, f. 241; Waurin, III, 5.

[4] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 132.

This warning proclamation, coupled with the efforts of the king's councillors and the Burgundian ambassadors, put an end to any new thumb-cutting expedition to Southwark or other outrages that may have been in planning, and London escaped the horrors of mob violence. But unfortunately not only London, but the entire kingdom was threatening to get out of hand. The passionate acts of which Warwick and his friends had been guilty—putting their opponents to death without so much as a pretence of a trial—had proved like a torch to tinder, and the whole country was ablaze. A Lancastrian insurrection was even being organized along the Scottish border by that irrepressible agitator, Humphrey Neville of Brancepeth, who may have thought that Warwick would go a step further and dethrone Edward. But what Warwick wanted was not the restoration of Henry VI, much less of Margaret of Anjou, but a chastened Edward who would acknowledge that he had been led astray by those now punished for their evil deeds and who would turn back with a contrite heart to beg for the friendship and advice of the man who had lifted him to the throne. So far was Warwick from sympathizing with Humphrey Neville that he sent out a call for troops to put down the new uprising in the north and countermanded the parliament in order that he might be free to take command of the army himself. At a meeting of the council held in London on 7th September, the chancellor read two letters which had just been received, one from the king, written at Middleham on 30th August under the signet and sign-manual, the other from Warwick, written at Sheriff Hutton on 2nd September. Warwick's letter has vanished, but the king's was a request that credence should be given to Richard Scrope, the bearer of the letters, to whom, he wrote, he had committed certain matters to be "opened on our behalf concerning our parliament, which by us and our cousin of Warwick and other of our council in these parts is not thought expedient to be kept at our city of York for such great causes and considerations as we have charged the said Richard Scrope to declare unto you."[1]

---

[1] Writs of Privy Seal, file 827, nos. 2883, 2886; Close Roll 9 Edw. IV, m. 28; London Journal 7, f. 199b; Rymer, XI, 648.

The writs of supersedeas were sent out at once, and the only excuse given for not holding the parliament was the time-honoured one that the king understood that his adversaries of France and Scotland were planning to invade the kingdom.[2] But it is proof of Warwick's anxiety to keep up all the proper legal forms that in the meantime, on 4th September, he had sent the chancellor another mandate, this time under the privy seal. In this new mandate three reasons were given for the countermanding of the parliament—"the great troubles in divers parts of this our land not yet appeased," the fact that the knights of the shire could not be elected in time, as the shire day in the county of York and, it was understood, in other counties also, fell after the day appointed for the beginning of the parliament, and, finally, the impossibility that a parliament called on such short notice should be "whole and under due and lawful form summoned." The chancellor received even a third order, as Warwick seems to have decided, on second thought, that he had confessed too much. On 7th September Stillington was told to say simply that the parliament had been abandoned because no "county of York" would be held before 22nd September "ne to the third day after," and it was feared that "like case happens in other shires."[3]

But no words, however carefully chosen, could hide the truth. There were "great troubles," and Warwick was finding that it was beyond even his power to cope with the situation he had created. Perhaps Edward's popularity was greater or his own less than he had thought; or perhaps the imprisonment of the king had caused a reaction in his favour. At any rate, the people refused to heed the proclamation calling for men to put down

---

[1] Warrants of the Council, file 1547, 7th Sept., 1469; Warrants under the Signet, file 1381, 30th August. Edward's letter was addressed to Clarence, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the chancellor.

[2] Reports touching Dignity of a Peer, IV, 972-976. The king's beds had already been carried to York for his use during the parliament. Roll of Treasurer's Accounts, 9 Edw. IV.

[3] Writs of Privy Seal, file 827, nos. 2884, 2885.

Humphrey Neville's insurrection,[1] and it became evident that the only alternatives were to give Edward a greater show of liberty or to let Humphrey Neville do his worst. Warwick chose the former. Soon after 10th September Edward was allowed to go first to York and then, a few days later, to Pontefract Castle;[2] and after that there was no further trouble about raising the men needed to put down the Lancastrian rising. While the council in London sent Lord Ferrers to South Wales for fear other enemies of the king might "presume or take upon them to arrive there,"[3] Warwick marched to the scene of Humphrey Neville's activities, captured Humphrey and his brother Charles, and though the two men were probably his own kinsmen, sent them to the block at York. The execution of the two Nevilles took place on 29th September, and Edward seems to have gone up to York from Pontefract for the special purpose of witnessing it.[4]

Even the removal of Humphrey Neville, however, scarcely improved the situation. The country was still restless and out of temper, and in the end Warwick had to acknowledge and yield to the truth. England demanded that the king should be set at liberty. So, after Edward had given "fair speech and promise," the Archbishop of York took him back to London.[5] On 7th October the common council of London decreed that the mayor and aldermen, the sheriff, and four hundred commoners should go forth to meet the king when he came,[6] and a few days later Sir John Paston wrote to his mother that the king had arrived. "There came with and rode again' him," Paston said, the Dukes of Gloucester and Suffolk, the Earls of Arundel, Northumberland, and Essex, Lords Hastings, Dacre, Mountjoy, and Harry and John of Buckingham, and many other knights and squires, the mayor of London and twenty-two aldermen, "in scarlet," and two hundred craftsmen of the city,

---

[1] Hist. Croy. Cont., 552.

[2] Privy Seals. Edward was still at Middleham on 10th September, but he was at Pontefract from 19th to 30th September, if not longer, and in London, at the "palace of Paul's," by 13th October. From 16th October on he was staying at Westminster Palace.

[3] Warrants of the Council, file 1547, 12th Sept.

[4] Warkworth, 7.

[5] In France it was reported that Edward, while hunting, started off for London without Warwick's permission. Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 133. Warkworth says the king "scaped out of the bishop's hands," and Vergil tells an elaborate tale about his escape. But Paston's letter leaves no doubt that he was brought to London voluntarily by the archbishop. See also Hist. Croy. Cont., 551-552, and Waurin, III, 5-6.

[6] London Journal 7, f. 202b.

"all in blue." "The king came through Cheap, though it were out of his way, because he would not be seen, and he was accompanied in all people with a thousand horse, some harnessed and some not. My Lord Archbishop came with him from York and is at The Moor, and my Lord of Oxford rode to have met the king, and he is with my Lord Archbishop at The Moor and came not to town with the king." It was rumoured, too, Paston added, that Oxford and the archbishop had been the day before "three mile to the king wards from The Moor," but that the king sent a messenger to say that "they should come when that he sent for them"; and "what to suppose therein" Paston did not know. "The king himself," Paston declared, "hath good language of the Lords of Clarence, of Warwick, and of my Lords of York and of Oxford, saying they be his best friends; but his household men have other language, so that what shall hastily fall I can not say."[1]

What "hastily fell" was less startling than might be expected. Edward would have proved himself but half a man if he had not resented the humiliation that had been put upon him, to say nothing of the murder of his friends; and no doubt behind the "good language" he used regarding his captors was hidden a strong craving for revenge. He had the good sense to realize, however, that if he acted hastily and with passion, he would create new troubles for himself. His message to Oxford and the archbishop was equivalent to an announcement that henceforth he meant to do "what him liked,"[2] and in a little while Lord Scales dared to come out of hiding and to return to court wearing his father's title of Earl Rivers. But though Edward gave two offices, the constableship of England and the chief justiceship of North Wales, left vacant by the death of Rivers and Pembroke, to Gloucester, a brother whose fidelity shone the brighter by contrast with the faithlessness of Clarence, and ventured to remove Langstrother from the treasurership, replacing him with the Bishop of Ely,[3] he showed no malice towards those of his councillors who had tolerated, if not applauded, Warwick's deeds. So much discretion and self-restraint did the king display, in fact, that it is hard to understand how he happened to commit one serious blunder. Warwick's brother had been conspicuously loyal during the dark months just past, and Edward loved him "entirely;"[1] yet on 27th October Henry Percy, by hereditary right Earl of Northumberland, was released from the Tower, after he had taken the oath of fidelity and given bonds to the amount of eight thousand pounds.[2]

---

[1] Paston Letters, V, 62-63.

[2] Warkworth.

[3] Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 176, 178, 179. Langstrother received £37 5*s*. 1*d*. for the brief time he held office. Issue Roll, Mich. 9 Edw. IV, 10th Oct.

The release of Percy was the more extraordinary because it had the appearance of a partial yielding to the demands of the dead Robin of Holderness; and unless it was just another case of thoughtless good nature, such as the pardon granted to Margaret of Anjou's old friend, Doctor Mackerell, who had been captured a few months since in Norfolk or the neighbourhood,[3] it can only be explained as a bid for the good-will of the turbulent north. But unhappily it frightened, and alienated the affection of the Earl of Northumberland without putting an end to Lancastrian agitation. If the north was quiet for the moment, the king's fears were only transferred to Wales, where, in spite of the presence of Lord Ferrers and of a proclamation calling on the people of Anglesea, Caernarvonshire, and Merionethshire to obey the king's laws and to make their customary yearly payments on pain of his "great indignation," one Morgan ap Thomas ap Griffith and other rebels seized the castles of Caermarthen and Cardigan and continued to make forays into the country round about until the Duke of Gloucester was sent to punish them.[4] In short, as Warwick had found that he could not keep England under control without Edward's help, so Edward now found that, in order to restore peace in his restless and perplexed kingdom, he would have to obtain Warwick's help. Reluctantly, therefore, the king held out the olive branch, and after many messages had been exchanged, both Warwick and Clarence finally promised to come to London for a council meeting to which all the peers of the realm had been summoned.

The council assembled early in November in the Parliament Chamber, but apparently Warwick and Clarence did not arrive to attend it until the end of the first week in December, and its sessions were not over until 10th February or later.[5] The chief thing gained was an agreement that all parties should forget their grievances,[1] and it was Edward who had to make the concessions. Not only did the king have to grant a general pardon to Warwick and Clarence and to all his subjects who had been guilty of insurrections, murders, riots, or assemblies before 11th October,[2] but he had to remit, if not the whole, at least the first part of the second of the fifteenths and tenths that had been granted to him by the Commons the year before.[3] He also consented to the betrothal of his eldest daughter, now nearing her fourth birthday, to George Neville, the eldest son of the Earl of Northumberland and Warwick's nearest male heir, a boy of about nine years, who, on 5th January, was created Duke of Bedford to make him a more fit mate for a king's daughter.[4] But to this betrothal Edward may not have been averse, as it had evidently been agreed on in the spring, before Warwick's rebellion, and as his affection for Northumberland was still unshaken.[5]

---

[1] Hearne's Fragment, 306. Cf. Chastellain, V, 499.

[2] Rymer, XI, 648; Close Roll 9 Edw. IV, m. 13 dorso. A last payment to Percy for clothing while he was in the Tower is recorded in Langstrother's accounts. Roll of Treasurer's Accounts, 9 Edw. IV.

[3] Issue Roll, Easter 9 Edw. IV, 28th April; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 175.

[4] Cotton MS. Vespasian F XIII, f. 38; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 180.

[5] See the charter creating George Neville Duke of Bedford for proof that one meeting of the great council was held on 6th November, and the documents relating to the charges against the queen's mother for proof that another was held on 10th February. On 6th December the mayor and aldermen of

After all, Warwick had gained much. While he had been forced to return the reins of government to Edward, he had removed the men he hated most, and by the marriage of his daughter to the brother next in age, and the betrothal of his nephew and heir to the eldest daughter of a king who had no son, he had all but put the Neville family on the throne. Yet the earl was far from satisfied.

London decreed that during the coming night, and every night while Clarence and Warwick were expected, watch should be kept in the wards. London Journal 7, f. 207b.

[1] Hist. Croy. Cont., 552.

[2] Writs of Privy Seal, file 830, no. 3025—a proclamation of 16th February quoting an earlier one. Cf. Warkworth, 7; Fabyan, 657; Hearne's Fragment, 301.

[3] This is exactly contrary to what Warkworth says, unless, as I suspect, a few words have dropped out of the text of his chronicle at this point and completely altered the sense of the passage. For proof that Edward remitted the first part of the second fifteenth and tenth, see Warrants for Issues, 9 Edw. IV, 22nd Dec.—a grant to the Bastard of Burgundy of an assignment of £50 upon the customs collectors at London to replace a previous assignment upon the collectors of the first part of the second fifteenth and tenth granted "by the lay people" in the eighth year of the king's reign which had become valueless "because we of our special grace have pardoned the same unto the Commons of this our said realm." Cf. Rolls of Parl., VI, 6, 119.

[4] Charter Roll 8-9 Edw. IV, m. 2; Writs of Privy Seal, file 829, no. 2976. George Neville was eleven years old when his father fell in the battle of Barnet. Inquisitions *post mortem*, 16 Edw. IV, no. 29. John Stafford, younger brother of the Duke of Buckingham, was created Earl of Wiltshire at the same time that George Neville was created Duke of Bedford. Writs of Privy Seal, file 829, no. 2975; Close Roll 9 Edw. IV, m. 2.

[5] See Dallaghexia's letter of 12th April, where, however, the Earl of Northumberland and his son are evidently confused with each other. Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 129.

What he had wanted most was to regain his supremacy over Edward and to be able to prove to the king of France that he had regained it, and this, despite his astonishing victory, had been denied him. Edward was still guiding the affairs of England to suit himself, and his attitude towards France had changed not one title. Almost the first thing the king had done after he found himself a free man again was to take the oath of the Order of the Golden Fleece and write his thanks for the honour Charles had bestowed on him.[1] And in a few weeks Duras, Vaughan, Doctor John Russell, and Garter King-of-Arms were sent to Burgundy to assist at Charles's formal investiture with the Garter.[2]

It turned out again, therefore, that Warwick had no good news to write to Louis XI, who meanwhile had been hearing such contradictory stories about what was going on in England that he did not know what to believe. As soon as he was told that Edward had fallen into Warwick's hands, Louis had decided that Monypenny ought to go to England again, but before his envoy had had time to leave France, word came that Edward had escaped and returned to London, that some of Warwick's men had deserted to him, and that there was likelihood of another battle. Consequently Monypenny thought best to wait in Normandy until it was known what had really happened.[3] However, as Edward had come to see that he would have to make peace with Warwick, so also he came to see that, while matters stood as they now did, it was better to keep on good terms with the king of France. So he granted a safeconduct for Monypenny and two other "councillors" of Louis on 27th January and renewed it on 20th February.[4] If this safeconduct was not used, it was the fault, not of Edward, but of Louis himself, who was enraged when he was told that Charles had accepted the Garter and greatly frightened when it was reported that Edward and Warwick had made up their differences. Hearing that the English were equipping a fleet, Louis again jumped to the conclusion that Warwick had been playing him false, and he called out the *ban* and *arrière-ban* with the announcement that the king of England had made peace with the lords and commons of his realm and, with their advice, had resolved to make war on France.[1]

---

[1] Reiffenberg, 61-62.

[2] Charles took the oath of the Order of the Garter at Ghent on 4th February, and Russell delivered an oration which was afterwards printed by Caxton. Rymer, XI, 651; Commynes-Lenglet, II, 195; Waurin, II, 399-400. Edward's commission to Duras, etc., was given on 10th January under the seal of the Order of the Garter. Legrand collections, MS. français 6977, f. 20. Olivier de la Marche, for whom Edward granted a safeconduct on 7th February, probably accompanied the English ambassadors on their return home. French Roll 9 Edw. IV, m. 5; La Marche, notice biographique, xlvi (where by mistake it is stated that La Marche was going to Henry VI). La Marche was in England most of the time for some months to come, and in June Edward licensed him to import into England, without paying customs, five hundred complete "harnesses" and one hundred archers' helmets. French Roll 10 Edw. IV, m. 2; Writs of Privy Seal, file 832, no. 3110.

[3] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 132-134.

[4] Rymer, XI, 650; French Roll 9 Edw. IV, m. 2; Signed Bills, file 1501, no. 4321.

Only one thing did Louis have to console himself with as he mourned over his supposed loss of power over Warwick and waited with dread for the appearance of the English fleet. This was the knowledge that he had succeeded in stealing one of Edward's allies while Edward's attention was engaged elsewhere. In November he had been able to proclaim the renewal of France's ancient alliance with Castile.[2] This did not mean an open breach between Edward and Henry the Impotent, but it did mean that Edward need hope for no help from Castile if he ever carried out his intention of invading southern France. When, in March, letters of protection were granted to the merchants of Guipuscoa, Biscay, Old Castile, Asturias, and Galicia, Edward inserted in them a declaration that his alliance with the king of Castile and Leon remained in full force;[3] but though John Gunthorp, John Alcock, and Bernard de la Forsse were sent to Castile to try to recover what had been lost,[4] Henry the Impotent continued faithful to Louis till the day of his death, in December, 1474, and Edward must often have reflected with bitterness on the uselessness of the sacrifice he had made in renouncing his claim to the throne of Castile.

---

[1] Chron. Scandaleuse, I, 235; Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 135; Dupuy, I, pièces justificatives, no. 5.

[2] Chron. Scandaleuse, I, 232.

[3] French Roll 10 Edw. IV, m. 10; Writs of Privy Seal, file 831, no. 3051. Peter Sans of Venesse (Venasque) seems to have procured these letters for the five provinces, and Edward gave him an annuity of £20, to be paid so long as the peace between England and the five provinces continued. See a regrant of the annuity made in August, 1471. Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 273. In July, 1470, Edward also presented "Piers Sans de Benyssa," then in England, with some woollen cloth. Warrants for Issues, 10 Edw. IV, 31st July.

[4] Rymer, XI, 653. Cf. Warrants for Issues, 10 Edw. IV, 26th March, and Signed Bills, file 1504, no. 4457.

CHAPTER VII

WARWICK'S SECOND FAILURE

THE English fleet which so disturbed the peace of mind of the king of France was commanded by Lord Howard and Thomas Neville, a natural son of the late Earl of Kent known as the Bastard of Fauconberg, and the avowed errand on which it had been sent out was to keep the sea and defend the realm against "the malice and power of the Hanses, called Easterlings," and against other "outward enemies, rebels, and traitors."[1] Such general orders might easily mask almost any intent, but if Monypenny had made use of the safeconduct Edward had granted to him, he would have been able to set Louis' mind at rest as far as any danger from England was concerned, for his sharp eyes would have seen that Edward was still in too much anxiety at home to think of attacking France.

Even before the council meetings in the Parliament Chamber were over, more disturbances had cropped out in the north. This time the trouble began in Lincolnshire, and it seemed to grow out of a quarrel between Sir Thomas Burgh of Gainsborough, and Lord Willoughby and Welles, supported by his brothers-in-law, Sir Thomas de la Lande and Sir Thomas Dymmock, which culminated sometime during the winter in the pulling down of Burgh's house and the abduction of his goods and chattels.[2] Outrages such as this were no novelty in England; even worse ones sometimes occurred. The Duke of Norfolk, in consequence of a difference with the Pastons, had recently laid siege to Caister Castle in Norfolk with as much determination as if it had been a stronghold of the French or some other national enemy; and a dispute which began in the reign of Henry VI between Lord Berkeley and the Countess of Shrewsbury terminated on 20th March of this year in a pitched battle at Nibley-Green and the death of Viscount Lysle, the countess's grandson and son-in-law of the late Earl of Pembroke.[1] But the country in general was not touched by the quarrels of the Pastons and the Berkeleys, whereas the seemingly less serious occurrences in Lincolnshire turned out to be the beginning of another rebellion, as Edward took up the cause of Burgh, who happened to be his master of the horse,[2] and Warwick made out of the king's interference a chance to strike again.

---

[1] Warrants for Issues, 9 Edw. IV, 21st Feb. Howard was to serve the king for ten weeks, beginning with 18th March, and was to receive "in great," for wages and rewards for himself and his fifteen hundred men, 1,875 marks. *Ibid.*, 3rd March. The city of London and the bishops and abbots of the realm supplied the money for the fleet. London Journal 7, f. 211-211b; Warrants for Issues, 9 Edw. IV, 21st Feb., and 10 Edw. IV, 4th March; Receipt Roll, Mich. 9 Edw. IV, 19th-23rd Feb.

[2] Warkworth, 8; Dugdale, II, 12. Lord Willoughby and Welles was the son of the Lord Welles killed at Towton and afterwards attainted. He had been restored in blood in 1468. Although Warkworth says the attack on Burgh occurred in March, it must have taken place in January or earlier.

No sooner had Edward commenced to show an interest in Burgh's affairs than the Lincolnshire people began to hear that he was coming to their country " with great power " and that his judges would " sit and hang and draw great numbers of the commons." This rumour was quite enough to quicken the spirit of rebellion again, and when, at the beginning of February, the Duke of Clarence's chaplain and another priest came to Lord Welles and his son, Sir Robert Welles, bringing them letters of credence from Clarence and Warwick and asking them to call together as many men as possible but not to "stir" until Warwick was safely out of London and Clarence gave the signal, the desired promise was made with alacrity.[3] Nothing happened at once, however, because, although the king proposed to start for the north on 4th March and gave orders for troops to meet him at Grantham eight days later,[4] just as the council meetings at Westminster came to an end, and before Warwick had been able to get away from London, a general pardon for all offences committed before Christmas was proclaimed. Even those who had been guilty of high treason were promised a pardon if they would apply for it at the Chancery, and those who, on account of poverty or other cause, were unable to make such application were promised a pardon by act of parliament.[1] At the same time Welles and Dymmock were summoned to the king's presence, and though Welles felt misgivings and charged his son to hurry to his rescue if he heard that his life was in danger, the two men obeyed. They betook themselves to London and there, though they seem to have been detained by the king, Welles and his son were granted a pardon on 3rd March and Dymmock on the 6th.[2]

---

[1] Paston Letters, V, *passim;* Dugdale, I, 365; The Berkeley Manuscripts (edit. by Sir John Maclean, Gloucester, 1883-1885), II, 111-112.

[2] In a pardon granted to him by Henry VI in December, 1470, Burgh is described as late knight of the body and master of the horse to King Edward. Pardon Roll 49 Hen. VI, m. 9.

[3] Confession of Sir Robert Welles, Excerpta Historica, 282-284.

[4] Kingsford's London Chron., 180; Chronicle of the Rebellion in Lincolnshire, 25-26; Coventry Leet Book, II, 353.

The prompt submission of Welles and Dymmock gave reason to hope not only that Sir Thomas Burgh would be left in peace hereafter, but that Lincolnshire would quiet down. But far from quieting down, by this time Lincolnshire was shouting for King Henry,[3] and this, while it alarmed Edward, also led him astray. For though, in spite of the concessions just made to him, Warwick still showed some signs of discontent and in February there was "much to do for bills that were set up in divers places of the city of the Duke of Clarence and him,"[4] there was no ground for thinking that he, and still less Clarence, desired the restoration of the house of Lancaster or regretted having put down Humphrey Neville's rising on Henry's behalf a few months before. On the contrary, Edward believed that Warwick would be very glad to help him in Lincolnshire, and when the earl left London, it was with the understanding that he would join the king on the northward march. "My Lord of Warwick, as it is supposed," wrote Paston, "shall go with the king into Lincolnshire; some men say that his going shall do good, and some say that it doth harm."[5]

When the day came for Edward himself to leave London, he was told that Clarence was expected in the city, and little dreaming that the duke's purpose in coming, as the duke himself stated when writing to Sir Robert Welles, was partly to "help excuse" Lord Welles and partly to "delay the king's coming forth,"[6] he postponed his departure for the sake of having a talk with his brother. After the duke's arrival, on Tuesday afternoon, 6th March, Edward went to meet him at their mother's home, Baynard's Castle, and, probably thanks to the presence of the Duchess of York, the interview seems to have been an entirely friendly one. If Edward felt

[1] Signed Bills, file 1501, no. 4320; Writs of Privy Seal, file 830, no. 3025.
[2] Confession of Sir Robert Welles; Pardon Roll 9-10 Edw. IV, m. 8.
[3] Warkworth, *ut sup.*
[4] Kingsford's London Chron., *ut sup.;* Flenley's Six Town Chron., 164.
[5] Paston Letters, V, 70.
[6] Confession of Sir Robert Welles.

any unpleasant suspicions about Clarence's reason for coming to London, they were dispelled when Clarence explained that he was on his way to the west to meet his wife, and as soon as the family conference was over, the public had the pleasure of seeing the two brothers ride together to St. Paul's to make offerings. A few hours later, with Lord Hastings, Sir Ralph Percy, so recently released from the Tower, and many other lords, the king left the city and rode to Waltham Abbey, where he spent the night. Yet no sooner was he out of sight than Clarence held consultation with Lord Welles, the Prior of St. John's, and other friends and then, after dispatching a "pleasant letter" to his brother to tell him that he had changed his mind about going to his wife and, instead, would join him when Warwick did, hurried away to find Warwick.[1]

So ready had Edward been to believe all that Clarence said to him that, while he was at Waltham Abbey, he drew up commissions for Clarence and Warwick to array his subjects in Warwickshire and Worcestershire.[2] The documents had not yet been sent on their way, however, when it was learned that on the preceding Sunday Sir Robert Welles had caused announcement to be made in all the churches of Lincolnshire, in the name of Clarence, Warwick, and himself, that, on pain of death, every man must be at Ranby Hawe on Tuesday in readiness to resist the king, who was coming to destroy the people. In addition to this, a child brought a letter from Lord Cromwell's steward at Tattershall saying that the insurgents were gathering in great numbers not only in Lincolnshire, but in Yorkshire and other counties, and that they were likely to be a hundred thousand strong before all was over. Incredible as these stories sounded, Edward decided to withhold the commissions he had just drawn up and also to send to London for Welles and Dymmock. But on reaching Royston, he received Clarence's "pleasant letter," and preferring to believe its fair assurances rather than the warnings coming to him from other quarters, he dispatched the commissions and even wrote Clarence a letter of thanks with his own hand.

Welles and Dymmock, with their guard, overtook the king at Huntingdon and, when questioned, they not only admitted that

[1] Kingsford's London Chron. and Flenley's Six Town Chron., *ut sup.*
[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 218; Rymer, XI, 652.

they knew all about the insurrection, but declared that they themselves were the "very provokers and causers" of it. In this way they evidently hoped to shield Clarence and Warwick, and for their own safety they probably trusted to the pardons so recently granted to them. But Edward's mood was growing more stern. He informed Welles that, unless he persuaded his son to submit, he and Dymmock would have to die, and then, while Welles wrote to his son in great alarm, he proceeded to Fotheringay, carrying his two prisoners along with him. The news received at Fotheringay was that Sir Robert Welles had passed Grantham and seemed to be making for Leicester. This was, indeed, the fact, as Warwick, whose plan was to trap the king again by letting him get well into the rebellious district and then throwing an army between him and London,[1] had told Sir Robert to let Edward pass and that he and Clarence would be at Leicester on Monday night with twenty thousand men. But before reaching Leicester, Sir Robert received his father's letter, and throwing Warwick's instructions to the winds, he instantly wheeled about and dashed off towards Stamford in the desperate hope of saving his father by force of arms.

Edward reached Stamford on Monday night, and there he was met by letters from Clarence and Warwick saying that they were on their way to join him, that they were now at Coventry, and that they would reach Leicester that night. But what the king was most anxious to know at that moment was what Sir Robert Welles meant to do, and very soon it was learned that Sir Robert was at Empingham, about five miles from Stamford and, instead of obeying the order to lay down his arms, was preparing for battle. On hearing this, Edward first of all sent Welles and Dymmock to the block and then, marching against Sir Robert, attacked him with all the suddenness with which Sir Robert had intended to attack him. As Sir Robert rallied his men, they began to shout "à Clarence! à Warwick!" and it was seen that he and some others were wearing Clarence's livery. But the names of Clarence and Warwick seemed to have no magic, for their friends quickly took to flight, throwing away their coats as they ran, and Edward was left the easy victor of "Lose-coat Field."[2]

When Sir Robert Welles had been put to flight, Edward returned, late at night, to Stamford; and so convinced was he, though the shout of "à Clarence! à Warwick!" should have taught him better, that the petty victory he had won would end the insurrection that on the following day, on his way to Grantham, he ordered proclamation to be made in every shire announcing his victory and recalling the commissions of array he had sent out. He was even naive enough to think that Clarence and Warwick would now repent of whatever evil design they might have been bent on again, and sending them word of what had occurred, he commanded them to disband the troops they had been raising in accordance with his commission and come to him with only such retinues as their rank required.[1] But in the meantime Sir Robert's men were being chased. A few of them, including Sir Thomas de la Lande, were captured and beheaded, but more were killed during their flight, and among the dead was one of Clarence's servants in whose "casket" were found papers which left no manner of doubt that there had been a plot for "the very subversion of the king and the commonweal of all this land." Later one Richard Warren was taken and, finally, Sir Robert himself, and from these two men was wrung a confession that Clarence and Warwick were the instigators of all the recent disturbances and that their object was nothing less than to destroy the king and set Clarence on the throne.[2]

---

[1] Chron. of Rebellion in Lincolnshire, 18.

[2] *Ibid.*, 6-10; Confession of Sir Robert Welles; Hearne's Fragment, 301-302.

After the confession of Welles and Warren, Edward could no longer shut his eyes to the truth. He had to see that Warwick, not satisfied with having robbed him of his friends, wanted to rob him of his throne as well. Perhaps when the messenger he had sent to Coventry came back with a promise from Clarence and Warwick that they would obey his summons and come to him with not more than a thousand or fifteen hundred men, he hoped again for a moment that, through their repentance, all would yet end well; but the next news he received was that Lord Scrope of Bolton and other friends of Warwick were fomenting another uprising in the North Riding, in Richmondshire, and that the people, excited by the execution of Welles and Dymmock, were saying that he had repudiated the pardon he had so recently proclaimed. This caused him to send instructions to the Earl of Northumberland to array his subjects in Northumberland and Westmoreland to crush this new outbreak[1] and afterwards, on the 16th, to issue from Newark a new proclamation. As he had been informed, he said, that certain seditious persons, seeking to stir up trouble among his people, had "sown untrue and unfitting language" about him, declaring that he did not mean to abide by the pardon he had lately granted and proclaimed and that he was coming to Yorkshire to destroy those who had made commotions there, he wished it to be known that it was his intention to keep his word "in every point." Again he announced a pardon for all offences whatsoever committed before 25th December and promised that this pardon should be extended by act of parliament to all his subjects without any charge for the "fine or fee of the seal." His clemency was tempered only by a command that no one, on pain of death and forfeiture, should make any assembly or gathering of his people in response to any message or proclamation which did not bear the great seal, the privy seal, or the signet seal.[2]

---

[1] Warkworth, 52-53; Signed Bills, file 1501, no. 4330; Chron. of Rebellion in Lincolnshire, 10-11.

[2] Paston Letters, V, 70; Chron. of Rebellion in Lincolnshire, 11. Cf. Confession of Sir Robert Welles.

On Saturday the king started for Doncaster, and on the road he received more "pleasant writings" from Clarence and Warwick in which, though they were really on their way to Derby, they promised to meet him at Retford. But Edward was no longer nursing illusions, and he sent Garter to Clarence with letters in which he informed the duke that from Sir Robert Welles and others he had learned "how ye laboured contrary to natural kindness and duty of liegance divers matters of great poise, and also how proclamations have been made in your name and our cousin of Warwick's to assemble our liege people, no mention made of us." Even now he told his brother that, if he would come to him "in humble wise," as a subject ought to come to his sovereign lord, he would treat him "according to your nighness of our blood and our laws"; but at the same time he warned him that, in case he delayed, he would have to punish him for example's sake, though he would be loth to do so, and that if blood were shed, the blame would not rest with him.[3] Yet even after this Clarence and Warwick continued to send deceitful messages. The next one was brought by Warwick's chaplain and was to the effect that the duke and the earl would come in humble wise as the king commanded, provided they were given a safeconduct and a pardon for themselves and all their friends. To this Edward replied with another summons to them to come to him at once and a reminder that he had already granted them a pardon and even, at their prayer, extended it to a "farther day."

---

[1] Chron. of Rebellion in Lincolnshire, 11-12.

[2] Close Roll 10 Edw. IV, m. 7 dorso. See also Signed Bills, file 1501, no. 4335.

[3] Chron. of Rebellion in Lincolnshire, 12-13; Ellis, Original Letters, Series II, Vol. I, 138.

On Monday, at Doncaster, Sir Robert Welles and Richard Warren were beheaded in the presence of the entire army, and just before their death they declared again that they had acted at the bidding of Clarence and Warwick.[1] Doubly indignant was Edward, therefore, when, almost at the moment that the heads of Welles and Warren rolled from the block, another demand for a safeconduct and a pardon came from the duke and the earl. Telling the messengers who brought the request that not even his ancient enemies of France would ask for "so large a surety for their coming to his royal presence," the king ordered them to go back to Clarence and Warwick and say to them that their sovereign lord would treat them as a sovereign lord ought to treat his subjects, but that, in view of the nature of the accusation against them, he could not afford, for example's sake, to be too liberal with his pardon. Nevertheless, he added that if the duke and the earl could prove their innocence, they would not be more glad than he would be, and he promised that, even if they were unable to do this, he would "minister to them rightwiseness with favour and pity." He also gave warning, however, that if they did not obey his summons this time, they should have what they deserved, and he spoke with such emphasis that the trembling messengers entreated him not to ask them to deliver his message, but to send it by a king-of-arms.[2]

Clarence and Warwick were at Chesterfield when they received this reply from Edward. Needing no interpretation of its meaning, they started before dawn on Tuesday morning for Manchester, where they hoped Lord Stanley would meet them with more troops.[3] They departed none too soon; for the same morning, at nine o'clock, Edward set out for Chesterfield, and a correspondent of John Paston wrote of the king's army that it was said that never had England seen "so many goodly men and so well arrayed in a field."[1] Not until he got to Rotheram did the king learn that the birds had flown, and then, as it was useless to go on, he turned back to Pontefract and from there went to York, for the double purpose of obtaining supplies and of putting himself between Warwick and "the strongest of the north part." As for Yorkshire, all was quiet there now, as the Earl of Northumberland had again done his work well. So well, in fact, had Warwick's brother performed his task, that Lord Scrope of Bolton, Robin of Redesdale himself, and many other persons came to York to ask for a pardon; and they swore as solemnly as Sir Robert Welles and Richard Warren had done that Clarence and Warwick were responsible for all the recent disturbances.[2]

---

[1] Paston Letters, *ut sup.*; Chron. of Rebellion in Lincolnshire, 17.

[2] Chron. of Rebellion in Lincolnshire, 14-16.

[3] Vergil says that Stanley refused to bear arms against the king, but we shall find that he gave his support to Warwick later on. At this time he was quarrelling with the Duke of Gloucester about some matter. Close Roll 10 Edw. IV, m. 7 dorso; Signed Bills, file 1501, no. 4339.

Edward's chief fear now was that Clarence and Warwick would escape either to Calais, of which Warwick was still captain, or to Ireland, of which Clarence was lieutenant. Consequently orders were sent to Calais that if the duke and the earl appeared there, they were not to be allowed to enter the town, and to Ireland that if they sought a refuge there, they were to be arrested. At the same time the lieutenancy of Ireland was transferred from Clarence to the man who had incurred such intense hatred in the island two years before by his execution of the Earl of Desmond and other acts of cruelty. For, unfortunately, in these days when he was bereft of so many of his friends and felt himself sinking in a slough of treachery, Edward was learning to cling more and more to the Earl of Worcester, whom already, two days after the battle of Lose-coat Field, he had made constable of England, seemingly as a notification to the insurgents that they need look for no mercy.[3] Yet while the king threatened, he also coaxed. Glad of an opportunity to put a permanent check on the power of the Nevilles in the north, he suddenly threw another sop to his discontented subjects there. On 25th March he restored the earldom of Northumberland to Sir Henry Percy, whom he had brought with him from London, probably with this purpose in view, and asked Warwick's brother to accept in exchange for that princely earldom the title of Marquis of Montagu. Strange as it may seem, the king had persuaded himself that the man who had been so singularly faithful to him when the temptation to be treacherous was so great would willingly give up the first earldom of the north for the sake of a title which brought with it no advantages except elevation in rank and the paltry sum of forty pounds a year from the revenues of the county of Southampton.[1] How great was his mistake he was to discover at a very critical hour.

---

[1] Paston Letters, V, 71.

[2] Chron. of Rebellion in Lincolnshire, 12, 16-17; Paston Letters, *ut sup.*; Hist. MSS. Com., MSS. of Corporation of Beverley, 145.

[3] Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 205; Rymer, XI, 654.

In the meantime, on the 24th, another proclamation had been issued publicly calling Clarence and Warwick to account for their ingratitude and treachery and summoning them once more to appear before the king "in humble and obeissant wise" before the 28th. If they would come by that time and declare their innocence, the proclamation stated, the king would be "right glad and have them in his grace and favour," but if they failed to come, they would be considered rebels and traitors and, on pain of death, every man must do his utmost to arrest them and their supporters and bring them to the king. To stimulate a desire to capture the traitors, the person who took the duke or the earl was promised a gift of land of the yearly value of a hundred pounds from his prisoner's estates or, if he preferred, a thousand pounds in money; and for every knight captured the reward was to be twenty pounds worth of his land or a hundred marks in money, for every squire ten pounds worth of his land or forty pounds in money.[2] But almost before the ink was dry on this proclamation, it was learned that Clarence and Warwick had fled westward, and after sending a call for troops into the western counties, the king started off in pursuit of them. Five days later, at Nottingham, he issued still another proclamation quoting his last one and announcing that Clarence and Warwick were now self-confessed rebels and traitors and must be treated as such, and then, when he had written a letter to the magistrates of the city of Salisbury telling them to be on the alert to take the duke and the earl, if they passed that way, and to have a band of mounted men ready to join his army when he arrived and provisions for forty thousand men, he hurried on to Coventry. By 11th April he was at Wells and by the 14th at Exeter. Yet, with all his haste, he was too late. On reaching Exeter he found that Clarence and Warwick had been there with their wives and a small number of men, but that they had already seized some ships and sailed for Calais.[3]

[1] Charter Roll 8-10 Edw. IV, m. 1; Signed Bills, file 1501, no. 4340; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 206; Dugdale, I, 308; Paston Letters, *ut sup.*

[2] Warkworth, 53-56.

[3] *Ibid.*, 56-59; Rymer, XI, 655; Rolls of Parl., VI, 233; Hatcher, Old and

As he passed the Isle of Wight, Warwick tried to carry off his own ship, the *Trinity*, which had been blessed with so much ceremony the year before and which at that moment was riding at anchor in the harbour of Southampton, evidently waiting to take its place in a fleet soon to be taken to sea by Earl Rivers. But Anthony Woodville was not caught napping this time, as he had been on the famous occasion at Sandwich when he and his father were seized in the night and carried off to Calais. He not only drove Warwick off, but captured some of the earl's men and one or two of his ships.[1] Warwick's worst misfortune, however, awaited him at Calais; for although he had never doubted for a moment his welcome at Calais, both because he had been captain of the place so long and because he knew that Lord Wenlock was there, as he entered the harbour he was greeted with shots. Edward's order that he was not to be received had arrived before he did, and Lord Duras, who seems to have been marshal of Calais at the time, and the larger part of the garrison had decided, in spite of Wenlock's entreaties, that it should be obeyed. At first the earl could not believe that Calais really meant to drive him away, and drawing back out of range of the guns, he endeavoured to negotiate. By this time the Bastard of Fauconberg had broken away from Lord Howard and joined him with some of the ships of the fleet that was supposed to be keeping the sea and defending the realm against the Easterlings and other outward enemies, but though he lingered about for several days, during which he or the Bastard captured some thirty or forty Burgundian ships and a few Breton ones and the Duchess of Clarence gave birth to a son, Calais, strengthened in its loyalty to Edward by a promise of aid from the Duke of Burgundy, still declined to have anything to do with him. Wenlock managed to send some wine to comfort the Duchess of Clarence in the throes of childbirth—a gift which may have eased the mother, though it failed to save the life of the child[2]—but with the wine came advice to Warwick to give up all hope of getting into Calais and to retire to France. At last, with great reluctance, the earl decided to follow this counsel, and though Lord Howard was now on his trail

---

New Sarum, 174; Hist. Croy. Cont., 553; Privy Seals.

[1] Warkworth, 9. According to Hearne's Fragment, Clarence and Warwick captured Rivers and also Lord Audley and sent them to Wardour Castle, whence they were rescued the following night by a Devonshire gentleman. But no one else tells this tale.

[2] The child was "buried by Calais." The Rows Rol, ¶58.

and succeeded in taking from him some of the captured Burgundian ships, he reached Honfleur in safety about the first day of May.[1]

For several weeks past Louis XI's hopes in regard to England had been rising one day and falling the next, as all sorts of stories were still reaching his ears. Late in March he was told that Clarence and Warwick had left London after a worse quarrel with the king than ever, and with delight he made hurried preparations for war. Two weeks later he was still more elated, as then it was reported that there had been a great battle, that Edward himself had been killed, and that everything was in Warwick's hands. "To-day after dinner," Sforza di' Bettini wrote on 3rd April, "his Majesty happened to see me, and very joyfully told me this news."[2] But Louis' joy was short-lived, as the next thing he heard was that Clarence and Warwick had arrived at Honfleur and desired an asylum in his kingdom. This unexpected turn of events was startling indeed, and for a moment Louis was a little aghast, as some ambassadors from the Duke of Burgundy who were with him at the time besought him not to let the fugitives remain in France. But though it was evident that, if he took Clarence and Warwick under his wing, he would get himself into new trouble with Charles, the situation held many alluring possibilities, and in the end he sent two of Warwick's old acquaintances, the Archbishop of Narbonne and the Bastard of Bourbon, admiral of France, to extend a welcome to the earl and his companions.[3]

The news that Calais had turned Clarence and Warwick away reached Edward at Salisbury as he was returning from his fruitless pursuit of them into Devonshire, and it brought much relief to his mind. Taking it for granted that every man in Calais and the pale was deserving of his gratitude, he at once made Wenlock lieutenant of the town and marches of Calais and reappointed Richard Whetehill lieutenant of Guines and John Blount lieutenant of Hammes. A few days later he also sent a general pardon to all the soldiers and citizens of Calais, Guines, and Hammes for all offences they might have committed before 24th April, though he was careful to state that he did not extend his grace to Margaret of Anjou and her son and their adherents or to Clarence and Warwick and their adherents. But in regard to Wenlock's deserts the king seems to have been undeceived very soon, as on 11th June Earl Rivers was made "general governor and lieutenant" of Calais and Guines.[1] That it was very unwise to affront Wenlock, however, the Duke of Burgundy realized if Edward did not, and Charles sent Philip de Commynes to Calais to offer Wenlock a pension of a thousand crowns. Wenlock felt no scruples about accepting Charles's money, and he and all the garrison and men of the town swore "entre mes mains," says Commynes, a solemn oath of fidelity to King Edward. But how little Calais was to be relied on was made clear when Edward, acting on Charles's advice to make sure of Calais before Warwick was ready to leave France, sent a hundred archers to strengthen the garrison; for these men were driven away as unceremoniously as Warwick had been, the garrison declaring that, until their own wages had been paid, no more of the king's men should enter the town.[2]

---

[1] Commynes, I, 198, 200; Plancher, IV, cclxx, cclxxxiii; Morice, III, 210-212; Commynes-Lenglet, III, 132-134; Basin, II, 219; Waurin, III, 30-32. Waurin must be wrong in saying that Clarence and Warwick landed at Honfleur on 5th May, as Charles wrote to Louis on that day complaining because they had been permitted to take refuge in France.

[2] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 135.

[3] Waurin, III, 30-31; Chronique Scandaleuse, I, 238; Plancher, IV, cclxi, cclxxxiii; Haynin, II, 153; Hist. Croy. Cont., 553; Hearne's Fragment, 303.

From Salisbury Edward went to Southampton, accompanied by the new constable of England. Measures had already been taken to secure a few of Warwick's most important friends. The Earl of Oxford succeeded in escaping to France, but the Archbishop of York was already under guard at The Moor, and the Prior of St. John's, though, thanks to the intercession of the Archbishop of Canterbury, he "went a season at large under surety," was soon in the Tower. Upon some of the earl's more helpless and insignificant adherents, however, the king's hand was to fall with much greater severity. Edward had determined to make an unforgettable example of the men Rivers had captured during Warwick's attempt to spirit away the *Trinity*, and it was on that account that he took Worcester with him to Southampton. Two other prisoners, taken by Lord Howard as they were trying to reach France, were also awaiting trial at Southampton—Sir Geoffrey Gate and the man Clapham who had come so opportunely to Robin of Redesdale's assistance at the time of the battle of Edgecott. But Gate, probably because he had been a good servant in the past, was allowed to live and, despite the preference he showed for the protection of the Westminster sanctuary, was given a pardon a month later; and though Clapham was beheaded, that seemed a light punishment in comparison with the sentence which Worcester pronounced on twenty other men. For the earl not only condemned those twenty men to be hanged, drawn, quartered, and beheaded, a sentence not uncommon in those days though probably rarely carried out in full, but he added a bit of savagery unknown to English law, impalement. His victims got a lasting revenge, however, as this barbarous novelty was so deeply resented that the introducer of it, already sufficiently unpopular, became "greatly behated among the people." Worcester's contemporaries dubbed him "the butcher of England," and in spite of the admiration due to his learning and culture, that nickname clings to him still.[1]

---

[1] French Roll 10 Edw. IV, m. 4, 6, 10, 11; Writs of Privy Seal, file 831, no. 3098, file 832, nos. 3107, 3111, 3116.

[2] Commynes, I, 199; Chastellain, V, 492; Lettres de Louis XI, IV, 351; Warrants for Issues, 10 Edw. IV, 21st June—an order to pay £100 to Thomas Garnet and John Young for the wages of one hundred men sent to guard Calais and the marches.

Believing that what had been done at Southampton would suffice to teach the lesson he wished to impart, Edward offered the usual pardon to all who would submit at once, before 7th May,[2] and after again lingering for a time at Salisbury, went on, early in June, to Canterbury. There the queen and his eldest daughter met him, likewise the new Marquis of Montagu, the new Earl of Northumberland, and many other lords spiritual and temporal who had been summoned for a meeting of the great council. During the two days' council meeting—though nothing is certainly known about its proceedings except that a decision was made that both convocations should be asked to meet in July—the chief topic discussed must have been the rebellion of Clarence and Warwick and the probability that they would return to make further trouble.[3] Commissions of array for defence against the duke and the earl had already been sent into the southwestern counties, but Kent would also be a convenient landing place for the rebels, and not only was Sir John Scott sent to hold Dover Castle, but when the council meeting was over, Edward made a personal visit to Dover and Sandwich to make sure that all was safe. After that, however, trusting that Scott and the Earl of Arundel, to whom had been given Warwick's old office of warden of the Cinque Ports, would be equal to the task of guarding the Kentish coast and controlling the Kentishmen in case Warwick did appear, the king again turned his face towards London.[1]

---

[1] Warkworth, 9; Fabyan, 658; Kingsford's London Chron., 181; Hearne's Fragment, 305-306; Paston Letters, V, 80. For Gate's pardon, see Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 209. Edward sent out an order for the arrest of the Archbishop of York while he was hurrying to Devonshire. Signed Bills, file 1501, no. 4347; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 217.

[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 207.

[3] Privy Seals; Chron. of John Stone, 113-114; Close Roll 10 Edw. IV, m. 5 dorso; Signed Bills, file 1502, no. 4358; Wilkins, III, 606.

By the time Edward reached London, Clarence and Warwick had been in France more than a month and he was receiving warning after warning of danger both from the treasurer and council of Calais and from the Duke of Burgundy.[2] Charles, indeed, was liberal not only with his warnings but with his advice, for to others it looked as if Edward were less agitated by what had happened than he ought to be, and one of the over-sea chroniclers decided that the king not only had too much confidence in himself, but was inclined to be contemptuous of Warwick's courage.[3] Yet Edward, over confident though he may have been, was not quite asleep. Not only had he taken thought for the protection of his coasts, but he had sent a certain Winchelsea merchant named William Hore, owner of the *Carvel* of Winchelsea, "to espy and understand the demeaning" of the Earl of Warwick.[4] As Hore was "taken with Frenchmen and put to finance," he was evidently of little help, but probably there were other reconnoiterers who fared better. The king's chief reliance, however, was on his fleets. Though the Bastard of Fauconberg had gone over to Warwick, Lord Howard had chased the fugitives to France, and when Rivers's fleet got under weigh from Southampton, Warwick would be lucky indeed if he succeeded in reaching the coast of England again without being captured.

But unfortunately the plot that was hatching in France was more dangerous than Edward dreamed. The experiences of the past few months had taught Warwick at least two lessons. In the first place, he had learned the uselessness of trying to regain his old supremacy over Edward; he could not recover it by persuasion, and when he recovered it by force, he had found his position untenable. In the second place, he had discovered that his proposal to substitute Clarence for Edward excited no enthusiasm in England. Perhaps he had learned a third thing as well, namely, that his new son-in-law was weak and unreliable, as poor material, in another way, for the kind of king he wanted as was Edward himself; for, according to the reports reaching France, Warwick and Clarence had not been on the best of terms when they set out to overthrow Edward.[1] In any case, even before he landed at Honfleur, Warwick had decided upon an entirely new plan of action, a plan which the king of France had probably already hinted at and one in which Clarence could have little or no share. He had decided to offer to assist Margaret of Anjou to replace Henry VI on the throne and, that he might not lose what he had hoped to gain for his family through Clarence, to demand her consent to a marriage between her son and his daughter Anne, the younger sister of the Duchess of Clarence. Gratitude for so great a service, Warwick told himself, would not only wipe from the memories of Henry and Margaret the share he had had in their misfortunes, but would make them so ready to bow to his will that he would become again the virtual ruler of England. With this vision before his eyes, he made haste to lay his plan before Louis, telling him that, if he would assist in restoring Henry of Lancaster to the throne of England, he could count on having the whole power of that kingdom to back him in his struggle with the Duke of Burgundy.[2]

---

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 209, 220; Warrants for Issues, 10 Edw. IV, 4th July (placed by mistake among Warrants for Issues, 11 Edw. IV); Chron. of John Stone, *ut sup.*; Privy Seals.

[2] Account of the Treasurer of Calais, Foreign Roll 11 Edw. IV, m. D. (payments to men sent to England in May, June, and August, 1470, with letters and words of warning regarding Warwick); Chastellain, V, 492; Commynes, I, 201.

[3] See Chastellain, V, 486, who also suggests (V, 493) that Edward ought to have sent Henry VI off to Burgundy.

[4] Writs of Privy Seal, file 836, no. 3322.

Again for a moment Louis hesitated. But he did not do so because he preferred to have Edward rather than Henry on the English throne, although, while Dauphin, he had contributed his mite towards Edward's accession. He felt no affection for either king, and all that he desired at any time with reference to England was to keep her in a state of turmoil which would prevent her from casting longing eyes towards France. Louis hesitated in part because his faith in Warwick was not implicit[3] and because a fugitive Warwick looked so different from the great earl who had come to Rouen three years before followed by a retinue of kingly magnificence; but still more did he hesitate because he knew that to lend

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 137.
[2] Basin, II, 222.
[3] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 136.

countenance to Warwick's scheme was to invite war with the Duke of Burgundy. Warwick had come to Louis' shores trailing after him ships stolen from Charles's subjects, and not only had Charles protested against the earl's being received in France, but as soon as he heard that the earl had actually been permitted to land in Normandy, he had written to the parliament of Paris, as well as to Louis himself, to say that, in view of the attacks which Clarence and Warwick had made on his subjects, he regarded their reception in France as an act of hostility towards himself and a violation of the treaty of Peronne.[1] However, the temptation to help Warwick was too great, and after taking steps to provide himself with a fleet to protect Normandy against a possible attack by the English,[2] Louis sent Monypenny and Jean Bourré, Seigneur du Plessis, one of his most trusted servitors, with careful instructions for the guidance of the Archbishop of Narbonne and the Bastard of Bourbon in their intercourse with the earl. Warwick was to be told that he should have all the help it was in the power of the king of France to give and that Louis had already sent for Margaret of Anjou and her son, who would probably do what was wanted of them; but at the same time he was to be informed that, on account of the treaty of Peronne, it would be impossible for Louis to receive him openly so long as he had in his possession any spoils taken from the Duke of Burgundy's subjects. Hospitality was offered to the Duchess of Clarence and the Countess of Warwick, but Clarence and Warwick themselves were asked to withdraw from Honfleur to the Channel Isles. After that, if they chose, they could send their ships, under pretence of victualling them, to Cherbourg or Granville, places which were "loin des Bourguignons" and where they should be well guarded, and in the meantime the king could make a pilgrimage to Mont Saint Michel and in that way arrange for a secret meeting with the duke and the earl at Granville.[3]

But to the request to withdraw to the Channel Isles Clarence and Warwick would not listen. They would not even go to lower Normandy, as Louis afterwards suggested. In spite of the king's repeated warnings that he could not possibly receive them until they had removed their ships beyond range of the Duke of Burgundy's vision, they stayed where they were and continued to beg for an interview, while Charles, not a whit appeased either by Louis' assertion that, at the time he granted Clarence and Warwick a safeconduct, he knew nothing about the injuries they had inflicted on the duke's subjects or by his offers to restore to their owners any ships or other booty still in Warwick's hands, wrote threatening letters and began to prepare for war on land and sea.[1] Charles maintained that, in reality, Louis was helping Clarence and Warwick to make war on him, not on England, since they had been thrust out of their homeland and would lose all the friends they had if they returned to it with an army, especially an army supplied by a foreign prince. Nor could Charles be blamed for taking this view of the matter, seeing that Warwick, even after his arrival in France, went on committing acts of hostility against him and his subjects. On one occasion the Bastard of Fauconberg captured and took back to Normandy some fifteen or sixteen ships of Holland and Zealand. On another Warwick sent a carvel belonging to the admiral of France to Sluys either to carry off or to burn some of the ships of the fleet Charles was gathering there, and though this object failed, another ship of Zealand was plundered. Charles's retaliation was to send his fleet to sea on 11th June, under the command of the Seigneur de la Veere and the Seigneur de la Gruthuyse, and to order the sequestration of all goods owned by subjects of the king of France which were to be found in his domains. But as Louis would not admit that in aiding Clarence and Warwick he was making war on Charles, so Charles claimed that in attacking Clarence and Warwick he was not making war on Louis.[2]

---

[1] Plancher, IV, cclxi-cclxiii. Cf. Chronique Scandaleuse, I, 239.

[2] Lettres de Louis XI, X, 298-299.

[3] Commynes-Lenglet, III, 124-125; Bricard, Un serviteur et compère de Louis XI, Jean Bourré, Seigneur du Plessis, 118-119.

Charles's fleet was joined at sea by Rivers's fleet from Southampton, and at once a dash was made at Harfleur. A number of ships were burned or carried off, some pillaging was done near Saint-Vaast-la-Hogue and other places, and then the combined fleets cast anchor at the mouth of the Seine to keep watch of the movements of Clarence and Warwick and prevent them from getting back to England.[3] But Warwick was not ready to go back

[1] Lettres de Louis XI, IV, 110-114; Plancher, IV, cclxviii-cclxxi; Commynes-Lenglet, III, 120-124; Bricard, 121, note 1.

[2] Waurin, III, 32 (he places the Bastard's exploit in September, which is certainly too late); Basin, II, 224; Commynes-Lenglet, II, 196. See also some letters from Charles to his mother, to the Count of St. Pol, and to the magistrates of Ypres and his order for the seizure of goods belonging to Louis' subjects. Plancher, IV, cclxxi-cclxxiii; Gachard, Documents inédits, I, 226-231.

[3] Commynes-Lenglet, III, 67, 79-80; Chronique Scandaleuse, I, 243; La

to England yet, though before this Louis had at last consented to receive him and, early in June, he and Clarence had betaken themselves to Amboise. "The Duke of Clarence and the Earl of Warwick arrived in this place on the 8th instant," wrote Bettini from Amboise on 12th June, "and were received by the Most Christian king in the most honourable and distinguished manner imaginable. His Majesty sent all the principal lords who happened to be at the court three or four leagues to meet them, and he himself went some distance out from the castle on foot to receive them, embracing them in the most friendly way. He also made her Majesty the queen come to the door of the castle to receive them and be kissed, according to the custom here. His Majesty then took them to their chambers in the castle and remained with their lordships two long hours most privately and with great familiarity. And so every day his Majesty has gone to visit them in their rooms and has remained with them in long discussions, while he honours and feasts them, giving them tournaments and dancing and everything else of distinction." However, on the very day Bettini wrote, the duke and the earl departed for Normandy again, as Margaret of Anjou and her son were expected at Tours in about a week and Warwick wanted Louis to try his powers of persuasion on Henry VI's consort before he himself approached her. When Margaret had consented to the marriage of her son with Warwick's daughter, the earl would return, Bettini said, "to give the finishing touches to everything, and immediately afterwards, according to all accounts, he will return to England with a great fleet, taking with him the said prince, in order to raise up the party of King Henry and to see if his plan will prove successful this way. Many are very hopeful about it, and his Majesty the king more than all. For the present his Majesty will give Warwick twenty-five thousand crowns and, according to what they say here, twenty-five thousand more two or three months hence."[1]

Perhaps Louis was not quite as sanguine about the outcome of Warwick's enterprise as Bettini thought he was, though one who wrote from Honfleur on 14th June stated that "toutes les nouvelles

---

Marche, III, 69-70; Enquête faite en 1471 sur une descente operée dans le Pays de Caux par les Anglais et les Bourguignons au mois de juin 1470, Mém. de la Société des Antiquaries de Normandie, Série III, Vol. 3, 11-14. Rivers's appointment as captain of the fleet was not sealed until 23rd June, though he certainly left Southampton before that date. French Roll 10 Edw. IV, m. 5.

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 138-139.

d'Angleterre sont que l'on tiendra pour Monsieur de Warwick."[1] The Duke of Burgundy's threatening attitude towards him, the pillaging of his coasts by the English and Burgundian fleets, and the heavy expense to which the presence of Clarence and Warwick in his kingdom was putting him, were quite enough to weigh on Louis' mind; and to make matters worse, his own subjects, especially the Count of St. Pol, the uncle of Edward's queen, had begun to complain about his extending hospitality to such shameless traitors as Clarence and Warwick had shown themselves to be.[2] At length Louis became so perturbed that, while he sent ambassadors to Charles in the vain hope of pacifying the duke with offers of reparation for the injuries his subjects had suffered,[3] on 22nd June he wrote to Bourré, who was still at Honfleur, that he, with the help of Monypenny and the admiral of France, must strive as gently and adroitly as possible to make Warwick see how much the success of his undertaking depended on his getting back to England at the earliest possible moment, and that, if necessary, the earl should be provided with ships. A day or two later Louis wrote again, telling Bourré not to give the earl any more money until he saw that he was actually going to sail. But though Bourré quite agreed with Louis that it was better to withhold all money until Warwick was ready to depart, he found it no easy matter to get the earl started, as Warwick wanted, first of all, to make sure of Queen Margaret and of the marriage of his daughter to the queen's son. The English ships were moving to Barfleur, Bourré reported, and the admiral was going to follow them, but as for himself, he would go no nearer in order to avoid, if possible, any further appeals for money.[4] In spite of Bourré's care to keep at a distance, however, at least one more request for money came, as on 8th July, from Valognes, whither he had gone to join his wife and the Duchess of Clarence, Warwick wrote to Louis' harassed minister asking him to send back to him by the bearer six thousand crowns which were needed for the ships assembled near Valognes and at Honfleur.[5]

---

[1] Legrand collections, MS. français 6972, f. 317.

[2] Chastellain, V, 463-464.

[3] *Ibid.*, V, 447-453; Plancher, IV, 274-287; Commynes-Lenglet, II, 196. In the end some Antwerp and Middleburg merchants who had suffered at the Bastard of Fauconberg's hands accepted compensation for their losses from Louis. Legrand coll., MS. français 6977, f. 26 dorso.

[4] Lettres de Louis XI, IV, 121-122, 349-350; Bricard, 122-123.

[5] The original letter is preserved in MS. français 20,486, f. 8, a copy in Legrand's collections, MS. français 6977, f. 173.

It was about 23rd June when Margaret of Anjou and her son arrived at Amboise, and the queen immediately agreed to a thirty years' alliance between her husband and the king of France.[1] But she was by no means so docile when it came to the question of an alliance with Warwick. "His Majesty has spent and still spends every day in long discussions with the queen," Bettini wrote on 29th June, "to induce her to make the alliance with Warwick and to let the prince, her son, go with the earl to the enterprise of England. Up to the present the queen has shown herself very hard and difficult, and although his Majesty offers her many assurances, it seems that on no account whatever will she agree to send her son with Warwick, as she mistrusts him. Nevertheless, it is thought that in the end she will let herself be persuaded to do what his Majesty wishes." Warwick, the writer added, had given Louis full powers to act for him and would agree to whatever the king accepted. "He is waiting for this arrangement to be made, as without the said prince it seems he is unwilling to return to England."[2]

Louis persevered in spite of Margaret's stubbornness, and in the end he conquered. By 3rd July matters had progressed so far that he wrote to Bourré that Warwick and Margaret were to meet at Le Mans and then there would no longer be any excuse for Warwick to delay.[3] Yet as it turned out, it was at Angers, and not until after the middle of July, that the meeting took place, and even then Margaret proved "right difficult." Warwick, accompanied by the Earl of Oxford but not by Clarence, arrived at Angers the same day Margaret did, that is, on 22nd July;[4] but it was some time before a settlement was reached, as to the last Margaret found it hard to make up her mind to have anything to do with the man who had been "the greatest causer of the fall of King Henry, of her, and of her son." On the evening of their arrival, Louis presented Warwick to the queen, and when the earl went down on his knees, begging for forgiveness and promising to be a faithful subject of her husband for ever more, Margaret let him stay there for a quarter of an hour.[1] To Oxford she was prepared to be gracious, for, as she told him, she "knew well that he and his friends had suffered much thing for King Henry's quarrels"; but to Warwick she refused her pardon until Louis had added his entreaties to the earl's and had undertaken to be his "surety." Even when Warwick's pardon had been granted, the whole battle was not won, as to the proposal that her son should marry the earl's daughter the queen indignantly refused to listen. There could be no profit in such a marriage, she declared, either for her or for her son, and she produced a letter, which she claimed she had just received from England, offering to her son the hand of Edward's daughter Elizabeth.[2] But Louis, as well as some of her father's councillors who had come with her to Angers, urged her to yield, and when at last she did so, Louis, without a moment's delay, sent a messenger to some envoys of the Pope at Lyons to see if they could grant a dispensation for the marriage.[3] The betrothal of the Prince of Wales and Lady Anne Neville was solemnized on 25th July,[4] and five days later, in the cathedral, Warwick took an oath on the "very Cross" that from now on he would "hold the party and quarrel of King Henry" and serve him, his queen, and their son as a true and faithful subject should, while Louis, and also his brother Charles, who so short a time since had been in league with Edward, swore that they and their successors would support Henry's cause and give no succour to Edward should he escape from England. Louis promised, in addition, that he would maintain not only Margaret and the Prince of Wales, but the Prince's wife and her children, if she had any, in France until London and the greater part of England had submitted to Henry and that, in case by any misfortune they were afterwards expelled from England, he would again receive them under his protection. All that Margaret swore to do was to treat Warwick as a true and faithful subject ought to be treated and never to reproach him for his past deeds.[5]

---

[1] Lettres de Louis XI, IV, 123-125. Louis' son Charles was born at Amboise on 30th June and the Prince of Wales was invited to be one of his godfathers. Chronique Scandaleuse, I, 241; Commynes-Lenglet, II, 196; Hearne's Fragment, 30.

[2] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 139-140.

[3] Lettres de Louis XI, IV, 128.

[4] According to "The Manner and Guiding of the Earl of Warwick at Angers" (Ellis, Original Letters, Series II, Vol. I, 132; Chron. of White Rose, 229), Warwick was at Angers from 15th July till 4th August. But Bettini wrote on 24th July that both Margaret and the earl had arrived "the day before yesterday," and on the 31st that they had departed that morning. Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 141, 142.

---

[1] Compare Bettini's letter and Chastellain, V, 467-468.

[2] The Manner and Guiding of the Earl of Warwick at Angers.

[3] They were not able to grant it, and on 2nd August Louis sent to the Archbishop of Rheims and the Bishop of Laon to see if they could do so. Archives curieuses, 94-95.

[4] Lettres de Louis XI, IV, 131.

[5] See, in addition to "The Manner and Guiding of the Earl of Warwick at Angers," the oath taken by the Duke of Guienne. Lettres de rois, reines, et

"The marriage of Warwick's daughter to the Prince of Wales is settled and announced," was what Bettini wrote on 28th July. "His Majesty has sent for the lady to Amboise where the marriage will be consummated. In two days Warwick will leave for his fleet, to direct it under the auspices of St. George to the enterprise of England. King Henry's brother, the Earl of Pembroke, is going with him, and if their affairs prosper, the king himself will immediately follow them."[1] But that Louis thought of going to England under any circumstances is highly improbable, and certainly the marriage of the Prince of Wales and Anne Neville was not to be consummated as promptly as Bettini thought. For on two points Margaret had her way. Her beloved son was not to set foot in England until all risk was past, and his marriage with Warwick's daughter was not to be "perfected" until Warwick had recovered the greater part of England for Henry.[2] When at last the Prince did go to England, he was to hold the office of regent and governor, since all knew that Henry himself was unfit to rule, and Warwick, of course, was to be his guide and mentor. As Clarence could not be overlooked altogether, it was agreed that he should have the duchy of York, in addition to the lands and dignities he had held before his flight from England, and also that he should succeed to the throne if Henry's son died without lawful heirs.[3] But this was giving little to the man who had counted on immediate possession of the crown, and Louis and Warwick were blind indeed if they did not foresee that sooner or later Clarence would make them trouble.

It was not Warwick, however, but a wiser man than he, who was peering anxiously into the future. Having secured his bargain with Margaret, Warwick seems to have felt no doubt about the success of his venture, whereas Sir John Fortescue, who since Henry's deposition had been the devoted tutor of the Prince of

---

autres personnages des cours de France et d'Angleterre, II, 488. The duke's oath determines the date of the ceremony in the cathedral.

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 141.

[2] Apparently no real marriage between the Prince and Anne Neville ever took place. See Gairdner, Richard III, 19. Bettini understood that when Margaret and Warwick left Angers, it was "to celebrate the nuptials of their children, as Warwick wishes to see them united before he proceeds to England." But a week later he wrote that Warwick had departed, adding: "He did not wish to lose time in waiting for his daughter's marriage. The ceremony will take place at Amboise, according to what they say." Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 142.

[3] The Manner and Guiding of the Earl of Warwick at Angers; Warkworth, 9-10; Waurin, III, 41.

Wales as well as Margaret's most steadfast friend, was sensible enough to realize that, even if Henry recovered his throne, he would lose it again if care were not taken to steer clear of the rocks on which he had come to grief before. Fortescue had eagerly promoted the alliance with Warwick, but not content to leave everything to this new and strange ally, he had drawn up, in the Prince's name, "certain advertisements" which he hoped would prove "expedient for the good public of the realm" and which Warwick was to communicate to Henry and his council. Knowing that there would be many persons who would look for personal benefits from the change of dynasty, Fortescue's first suggestion was that, to prevent the king's revenues from becoming so reduced that he would have to "live upon his commons and upon the Church, to his infamy and the withdrawing from him of the hearts of his subjects," Henry should grant no rewards until a council had been established which could examine into the merits of every claim and consider the state of his purse. Second, he proposed that the council should be composed of twelve spiritual lords and twelve temporal lords, the wisest and most impartial men to be found anywhere in all the land, who should be allowed to take no fee or reward nor to "be in any man's service otherwise than as justices of the law may do," and that the king should take no step of importance without the advice of this council. Third, he urged that, before any grants whatsoever were made, all ordinary expenses, such as the expenses of the household, chapel, and wardrobe, and of the courts and the council, should be provided for, and that at no time should grants be made "in inheritance" without the consent of parliament, or for life without the advice of the council. Fourth, he thought that, whenever possible, the expenses of the household should be paid "in hand," as in this way the king would be sure to have "alway the market at his gate, to his great profit but to much more profit of the poor people"; fifth, that the king should give no office, not even the humblest, to any but his own servants; and sixth, that, as the king was "now in great poverty," he should refrain for a year from keeping his "worshipful and great household."[1]

Probably Warwick received Fortescue's attempt to give advice with impatience. But he had gained so much that he could afford to put up with this slight annoyance, and it must have been with a sense of triumph that he set out for Normandy, with Margaret

[1] Plummer, Fortescue's Governance of England, app. B.

herself, the morning after the oath-taking in the cathedral.[1] On reaching Normandy, however, he found not only that Edward's and Charles's fleets were still on guard at the mouth of the Seine, but that his own men were on the verge of mutiny because their wages had not been paid. Consequently there was more delay and Louis, to his disgust, had to open his purse again. Nor was this the worst; for during Warwick's absence there had arisen a menace to his plans of which he knew naught, but which was to prove more disastrous to him than mutiny or the waiting fleets of Edward and Charles.[2]

Apparently Clarence had stayed in Normandy with the ladies while Warwick went to Angers, but the meaning of the negotiations going on with Margaret of Anjou was obvious, and the duke, weak and stupid as he was, could not fail to see that his dream of kingship had come to an end. His resentment, when he grasped the truth, was as deep as his ambition had been high, and just at this opportune moment a secret messenger arrived from Edward. Philip de Commynes, who had stayed on at Calais after Wenlock and all the men in the place had taken the oath to Edward, relates that one day, when he tried to persuade Wenlock to turn out of the town a score or more of Warwick's servants who might be tempted to make trouble if Warwick started for England, as it was understood he was about to do, that gentleman drew him aside and, after assuring him that he had Calais well in hand, bade him tell the Duke of Burgundy that he would better work for peace instead of for war, if he wished England well, adding that it would not be hard to adjust matters, as on that very day a lady had passed by Calais who was on her way to the Duchess of Clarence with letters containing overtures of peace from King Edward. But the real mission of the lady who passed by Calais was to entreat Clarence not to ruin his own family by helping to restore the house of Lancaster to the throne or to be so blind as not to see that Warwick was planning to give the crown to Margaret's son, to whom he had now married his daughter. And according to Commynes, who, when he subsequently discovered that Wenlock had deceived him, found comfort in remembering that Wenlock himself had been fooled by a member of the weaker sex, Clarence promised Edward's emissary that, when he got back to England, he would desert Warwick and become a loyal brother again.[1]

---

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 142.
[2] Bricard, 126-127; Chastellain, V, 468.

But if there were dangerous pitfalls in Warwick's path, there were also dangerous ones in Edward's. The Earl of Worcester's influence over the king was growing daily, and on 10th July the treasurership of England was added to the offices the earl already held.[2] Yet not even with the help of Worcester's brutal hand could Edward keep his kingdom under control. About the end of July London heard that there were "many folks up in the north" under the leadership of Lord Fitzhugh, the husband of Warwick's sister Alice, and that the Earl of Northumberland was powerless to check the insurrection.[3] The Marquis of Montagu was in the north at the time and was supposed to be raising men for the king, but there was no word from him, and Edward grew so uneasy that he decided to go north himself again. Not knowing what the days might bring forth, the king strengthened the defences of the Tower by ordering some "great ordnance" to be sent up from Bristol and an extra supply of bows and arrows and other munitions of war to be laid in,[4] and then, having established the queen, who was expecting another child in a few months, and his daughters in that safe shelter, he hurried away. By 5th August he was at Leicester, not many days later at York, and from York he went to Ripon. But farther than Ripon he found it unnecessary to go, as at his approach Fitzhugh, whose only purpose had been to draw him away from London, fled to Scotland and his followers dispersed. By 21st August the king had returned to York, and there he stayed, probably because he had found the city in such a turbulent state that he was obliged to send for a commission of *oyer* and *terminer* to reduce it to order. He soon decided, however, as he generally did under such circumstances, that forgiveness was the best policy, and on 10th September the great seal was attached to a general pardon for Fitzhugh and all his family and adherents.[5]

---

[1] Commynes, I, 202-203.

[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 211.

[3] Paston Letters, V, 80; Fabyan, 658; Hearne's Fragment, 305-306. Beverley provided Northumberland with twenty archers at this time. Hist. MSS. Com., MSS. of the Corporation of Beverley, 145. This goes to show that the earl made an effort to put down the insurrection.

[4] Exchequer Accounts, Mint, bundle 294, no. 19.

[5] Fabyan and Hearne's Fragment, *ut sup.;* Kingsford's London Chron., 181; Privy Seals; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 214-216. The warrant for the appointment of the commission of *oyer* and *terminer* for York was sent from Ripon and may be found in Warrants under the Signet, file 1381. The same

By lingering in York Edward played directly into the hands of his enemies. No doubt he stayed in the north because he believed that there was where he was needed, but his presence would have told for more in London than in Yorkshire. For to lose London was almost to lose the kingdom, and scarcely had he left the city when it was reported that the Courtenays had landed in Devonshire and that Clarence and Warwick were likely to arrive any day.[1] Not long after it was necessary to pull down from the standard in Cheapside, from the stulpes of London bridge, and from the doors of divers churches a manifesto in which Clarence and Warwick, claiming that they had been driven away by the " false means and subtle dissimulations " of certain covetous and seditious persons who had been directing the affairs of the kingdom with more consideration for their own interests than for those of the king and his people, called upon God and the Virgin, the Saints, the blessed martyr, St. George, and every true Englishman to be ready to help them when they came, " in right short time," to punish the said covetous persons, to see that justice was impartially administered, and to redeem England " from thralldom of all outward nations and make it as free within itself as ever it was heretofore."[2]

The special " outward nation " from whose thralldom Warwick proposed to deliver England was Burgundy, but it was by the aid of the most hated of all outward nations, France, that he expected to accomplish his end ! The glaring inconsistency scarcely needed to be pointed out, but neither did the danger. On 7th September Edward, still in York, dispatched letters to Kent in which, after stating that his ancient enemies of France and his " outward rebels and traitors " had leagued together and were planning to land in that county or the neighbourhood " with great might and power of Frenchmen," he ordered those to whom his letters were addressed to withstand the invaders or, if that proved impossible, to hasten to London, where, he said, he hoped soon to be himself.[3] But it was not in Kent that Warwick was planning to land this time, and the earl's foot was on England's shore before Edward started for London.

warrant announced the appointment of Gloucester as warden of the west marches.

[1] Paston Letters, V, 80. Edward had ordered the arrest of the Courtenays on 16th March, Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 217.

[2] Ellis, Original Letters, Series II, Vol. I, 135 ; Chron. of the White Rose, 234.

[3] Paston Letters, V, 83.

By the latter part of August Louis had grown so impatient at Warwick's delay in leaving France that he set out for Normandy to see what he could do both to hurry the earl off and to drive away the English and Burgundian fleets, which were not only holding Warwick back but were capturing fishing boats and burning houses on the French coast. What finally brought about Warwick's departure, however, was nothing that Louis said or did but a storm which scattered the blockading ships.[1] Seizing the opportunity afforded by this unexpected piece of good luck, and charged by Louis, who had sent the Seigneur du Bouchage, the Seigneur du Lude, and Tanguy du Chastel with some final instructions,[2] not to attack the Burgundian fleet unless they were attacked by it, Clarence and Warwick embarked at La Hogue on 9th September. The Earls of Pembroke and Oxford were with them, and their sixty ships, supplied by Louis, were under the command of the admiral of France, who, four days later, after dark, landed some of the party at Dartmouth and the rest at Plymouth and then immediately sailed for home.[3]

---

[1] Lettres de Louis XI, IV, 142; Commynes, I, 204; Basin, II, 227.

[2] B. de Mandrot, Ymbert de Batarnay, Seigneur du Bouchage, conseiller des rois Louis XI, Charles VIII, Louis XII, et Francois I (Paris, 1886), 35.

[3] Chastellain, V, 468-469; Chronique Scandaleuse, I, 245; Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 142; Fabyan, 658; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 183; Warkworth, 10; Stow, 422. It seems that some persons were ready to accuse the admiral of France of an intention to deliver Clarence and Warwick into the hands of the Duke of Burgundy, but Warwick himself, in a letter he wrote to Louis on 8th October, declared the accusation to be unwarranted. Waurin, III, 43-44, note.

CHAPTER VIII

WARWICK'S TRIUMPH: THE READEPTION OF HENRY VI

WARWICK'S first act, when he found himself in England again, was to issue another manifesto in which he called upon his fellow countrymen to rescue "our most dread sovereign lord, King Henry the Sixth, very true and undoubted king of England and of France," from the hands of "his great rebel and enemy, Edward, late Earl of March, usurper, oppressor, and destroyer of our said sovereign lord and of the noble blood of all the realm of England and of the good, true commons of the same." These were strange words to come from the mouth of the man who had done more than anyone else to make the "usurper" king, but, nothing abashed, the earl announced that, accompanied by the Duke of Clarence and the Earls of Pembroke and Oxford, and with the authority of "the most noble princess, Margaret, queen of England," and of the Prince of Wales, son and heir of King Henry VI, he had come to restore Henry to the throne. He summoned all the able-bodied men of the land, on pain of death and forfeiture, to give him their assistance and, at the same time, made an offer of amnesty to all except the "capital enemies" of King Henry and those who dared to resist his own present purpose. Remembering the harm done to the cause of the house of Lancaster in 1460-1461 by the excesses of Margaret's troops, he also warned his own men that they must avoid all quarrelling which might lead to the breaking of the peace, that the death penalty would be inflicted on any one of them who was guilty of robbery or of the ravishment of a woman, be she widow, wife, daughter, or servant, and that any man who helped himself to lodgings not assigned to him by the harbingers, or dislodged a fellow soldier from the place assigned to him, would be punished with imprisonment.[1]

---

[1] Harleian MS. 543, ff. 171-172. A part of this proclamation, taken from another source, is printed in Warkworth, 60-62, and in Chron. of White Rose, 236-240.

Having prepared the way for himself by this manifesto, Warwick proceeded to Exeter, accompanied by Clarence, while the Earl of Pembroke set out for Wales, the region in which Jasper Tudor's name would count for most.[1] As the Courtenays threw their influence into the scale, Devonshire leaned at once to Warwick, and plenty of men were soon gathered about the earl's standard at Exeter. As he advanced towards London, the towns through which he passed also supplied him, willingly or unwillingly, with men or money.[2] But the news he received from London was grave. His friends, the men of Kent, undeterred by the presence of Sir John Scott at Dover, had "waxed wild" as soon as they heard that he had landed in England, and large companies of them had wandered to the suburbs of London, where they robbed "divers Dutchmen" and plundered their beerhouses. In great alarm the magistrates of the city placed bombards and other deadly engines of war at the gates, at the bridge, and at the Guildhall, and when the guilds were called upon for armed men, they responded so generously that over three thousand, more than double the number expected, were soon assembled at the Guildhall. The common council ordered the suspension of the courts "during this time of war," and when the new sheriffs went to Westminster to be presented at the Exchequer, they were escorted by four hundred armed men to protect them from the Kentishmen.[3] But though London was determined not to be invaded by her marauding neighbours, it did not follow that she would shut Warwick out. Edward too was now on his way to London. With the Duke of Gloucester, Lord Hastings, and other noblemen, he had started for the city the moment he was informed that Warwick and Clarence had succeeded in reaching England. But as usual in a time of political crisis, the sympathies of the citizens were divided, and London would be the prize of the one who reached her first. On Sunday, 30th September, Doctor John Goddard, a Minorite who had preached at times before Edward's household, delivered a sermon at Paul's Cross which was intended to prove that Henry VI was the rightful king of England; but what was far more convincing than any sermon could be was the news which came the following day, the news that King Edward had fled![1]

---

[1] Stow, 422.

[2] Hist. MSS. Com., Various Coll., IV, 207-208; Hatcher, Old and New Sarum, 175-176.

[3] Fabyan, 658; Kingsford's London Chron., 181; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 183; Stow, *ut sup.*; London Journal 7, ff. 221-223.

As he set out for London, Edward sent orders to the Marquis of Montagu to meet him on the way with the large force which the marquis was known to have raised by this time and taken to Pontefract, and simultaneously he dispatched a messenger to Burgundy to acquaint Charles with the situation and to entreat him to keep his fleet at sea and prevent Warwick from getting back to France again, should he attempt to do so. But though the king pushed on with good courage, while he was passing the night at Doncaster the sergeant of his minstrels burst into his bedroom with the announcement that only six or seven miles away there were enemies who were "coming for to take him." And soon after he received other warnings from men who had escaped from Montagu's army. For though at first Edward refused to believe it, Warwick's brother had rebelled at last, and Montagu was the enemy who was "coming for to take him." Explaining that Edward had first given him the earldom of Northumberland and then deprived him of it without offering him any compensation save the title of marquis and "a pie's nest to maintain his estate with," Montagu had succeeded, by mingled threats and promises, in winning over all his soldiers with the exception of the few who stole away to admonish Edward of his danger.

Edward was more than satisfied with the experience of captivity which he had already had and, knowing that Montagu's army was considerably larger than his own, he waited for no further warnings but fled, not simply from Doncaster but from England. In crossing the Wash some of the men who had elected to share his fate were drowned and he himself narrowly escaped a like death, but the kindness of the gods was not quite exhausted yet, and on Michaelmas Day he arrived safely at Bishop's Lynn. There he embarked as many of his faithful followers as he could in the few ships that were available, and then, when Lord Hastings had dismissed the rest, after advising them to submit to Warwick while preserving their loyalty to their king, Edward IV turned his back on his kingdom and set sail for the shores of his brother-in-law, the Duke of Burgundy.[2]

---

[1] Stow, *ut sup.;* Household Accounts, 3-4 and 5-6 Edw. IV; London Journal 7, ff. 223b-224.

[2] Hearne's Fragment, 306; Fabyan and Kingsford's London Chron., *ut sup.;* Warkworth, 10-11; Hist. Croy. Cont., 553-554; Waurin, III, 47-48,

The sea as well as the land held its perils, for the Easterlings were abroad. Not long since Edward had offered to submit his quarrel with the Hansards to the umpirage of the Duke of Burgundy, but his offer had not been accepted, and in spite of the remonstrances of Charles, who feared for the safety of his own fleet, the Hanse towns had sent out their ships during the summer to harass the English.[1] Some of these Hanseatic ships now espied Edward's little convoy and set out to capture it. Only just in time did the king reach the coast of Holland, near the town of Alkmaar, and even then he was not safe, as the tide was out and he was unable to get into the harbour. He ran in near shore, but his pursuers, following him, cast anchor close by with the evident intention of swooping down on him as soon as the tide came in. Had help not come promptly, Edward of York might have spent the rest of his days as a prisoner in some distant Hanseatic town. But fortunately the Seigneur de la Gruthuyse, who was governor of Holland and who had apparently returned home when the English and Burgundian fleets were scattered by the storm, happened to be in Alkmaar, and as soon as he heard from some of Edward's men, who were sent ashore, that it was no less a person than the king of England who was in danger, he not only ordered the Hansards off, but went out in person to bid the king welcome. Edward had so little money that the only reward he could give to the master of the ship which had brought him away from his kingdom was a fur-lined gown and a promise of something better when happier days came, but Gruthuyse generously provided all that was necessary both for the king and for his men, and on 11th October, at his own expense, conducted them all to the Hague.[2]

The immediate effect which the news of the king's flight had on London was as deplorable as the effect which the news of Warwick's arrival in England had had on the Kentishmen. All sorts of criminals, political and otherwise, poured out of the sanctuaries; and although Sir Geoffrey Gate, who set himself up as Warwick's representative, ought to have realized, if no one else did, the harm that would result to Warwick's cause and to the whole community

---

note; Commynes, I, 205-209; Chastellain, V, 501-503, 508; Weinreich, Danziger Chronik, 733. Commynes says in one place that some seven or eight hundred persons were with Edward when he left England, in another that he landed in Holland with fifteen hundred men.

[1] Hanserecesse, II, 6, pp. 316-317. Margaret of Anjou had sought the aid of the Hanse towns in May but had accomplished nothing.

[2] Commynes, I, 208-209; Commynes-Lenglet, II, 196; Waurin, III, 48.

if the mob got the upper hand, he seems to have united with the rest in breaking open the prisons and liberating all who were "of their affinity." This encouraged the Kentishmen, who by this time had been reinforced by the boatmen, and there followed another raid on the suburban beerhouses in which English proprietors suffered this time as well as Dutch. When the drunken rioters endeavoured to enter the city, the mayor and citizens hurried to shut the gates and drive them away, but Queen Elizabeth became so frightened that during the night she fled from the Tower, with her mother and her three little daughters, to the Westminster sanctuary, and the chancellor of England, the keeper of the privy seal, the Bishop of Ely, and some others took refuge in the city's chief sanctuary, St. Martin's le Grand.

Even in the sanctuary the queen trembled for her life, and she sent the Abbot of Westminster to entreat the mayor and aldermen to take command of the Tower and keep out the Kentishmen and any other rebels who might attempt to attack the city. But to hold London for a king who had fled from the country was an impossible task, and though the mayor and aldermen kept six hundred armed men patrolling the streets night and day, in the end they were obliged to come to terms with Gate. It was agreed that all persons in the Tower should be permitted to keep their goods and to take sanctuary either at Westminster or at St. Martin's, and then, on Wednesday, 3rd October, the fortress was handed over to the joint keeping of the mayor and aldermen and Gate and his confederates.[1] There was one man in the Tower, however, who went neither to the Westminster sanctuary nor to St. Martin's. Although nothing had been said in the bargain with Gate about Henry of Lancaster, as soon as a new garrison had been installed in the Tower, the Bishop of Winchester and the mayor and aldermen went in search of King Henry, whom they found, John Warkworth says, "not worshipfully arrayed as a prince and not so cleanly kept as should seem such a prince," and whom they removed to a chamber which Queen Elizabeth had fitted up very handsomely for her approaching confinement.[2]

---

[1] Fabyan, 658-659; Kingsford's London Chron., 182; Warkworth, 13; Rolls of Parl., VI, 49-50; Paston Letters, V, 85; Sharpe, London and the Kingdom, III, 385-386. See also a letter written by Gerhard von Wesel, Hanserecesse, II, 6, p. 416. Fabyan and Kingsford's London Chron. give the date of the surrender of the Tower as 12th October, but that is a mistake.

[2] Warkworth, 11; Sharpe, *ut sup.*

After the surrender of the Tower events moved rapidly in London. On Friday the Archbishop of York, having shaken off the guard Edward had set over him at The Moor, arrived in the city with a large number of men-at-arms and took over the command of the Tower, and on the following day, about three o'clock, Warwick himself, followed by the army he had gathered up in Devonshire and as he marched through the kingdom, entered the city by Newgate. With Clarence, the Earl of Shrewsbury, Lord Stanley, the Bastard of Fauconberg, the Archbishop of York, and the Prior of St. John's, the earl rode at once to the Tower to kneel before King Henry; and when the king had been arrayed in royal robes, taken, it must be, from Edward's wardrobe, he was led through Cheapside to the Bishop of London's palace, where he was to remain for a few days and where he forthwith appointed Sir Henry Lowys "ruler and governor" of his household.[1] Warwick also took up his abode at the episcopal palace, but Clarence had to be satisfied with the hospitality of the Earl of Shrewsbury; and when the Earl of Oxford arrived on Tuesday "with a fair company," he found quarters in the house of the absent Lord Hastings. On the 13th Henry was taken in procession to St. Paul's, with Warwick bearing his train and Oxford the sword of state, and after the crown had been placed on his head as the visible sign that he was king once more, he went to Westminster Palace, where he was to begin life over again in the royal apartments from which Edward and Warwick had ejected him ten years before and where "daily much people and in great number" came to partake of his hospitality.[2] But Henry's "readeption" was held to begin, not on 13th October, the day of his recrowning, but on Michaelmas Day, the day of Edward's flight across the sea, and all writs and other public documents were now dated in "the 49th year from the beginning of our reign and of our readeption of our royal power the first year."

Henry VI now reigned again, but it was the Earl of Warwick who ruled, and Warwick was just as anxious as he had been when he held Edward captive that the machinery of government should feel the jolt of what had happened as little as possible. He avoided all changes that could be avoided, and in consequence few of his friends were rewarded with offices. For himself he took again the captaincy of Calais and the great chamberlainship, both of which he had held under Edward, and later he assumed the title of high admiral; but the title of lieutenant to King Henry VI, which he also assumed, he probably expected to retain only until the Prince of Wales arrived.[1] Clarence insisted on having some share in the supreme authority, and in one instance at least a proclamation was issued in his name alone; but the duke was not permitted to share in the title of lieutenant, and this denial was a cause of friction between him and Warwick from the start.[2] Even the lieutenancy of Ireland, which Clarence had every reason to suppose would be restored to him immediately, was given back to him very reluctantly and only after considerable hesitancy and delay. Not until 18th December was the mandate for his reappointment drawn up; not until 21st January was the mandate delivered to the chancellor, and not until 18th February were his letters patent actually sealed.[3]

---

[1] Warrants for Issues, 49 Hen. VI, 18th Dec. John Delves, who was killed in the battle of Tewkesbury, was treasurer of the household during Henry's readeption. Exchequer Accounts, Mint, bundle 294, no. 20; Warkworth, 18.

[2] Hist. Croy. Cont., 554; Warkworth, Fabyan, Kingsford's London Chron., and Sharpe, *ut sup.;* Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 183; Stow, 423; Waurin, III, 51; Commynes, I, 210. By 19th November the expenses of the household had amounted to £1,001 12*d*. ob., most of which Warwick had either "paid of his own good" or "undertaken for." Warrants for Issues, 49 Hen. VI, 18th Dec.

As Stillington had fled to sanctuary, Warwick felt justified in restoring the great seal to the Archbishop of York, and by a convenient fiction the archbishop's term of office was reckoned as beginning, like Henry's readeption, on the day of Edward's flight.[4] But for his other brother, the Marquis of Montagu, the earl seems to have done nothing save to return to him the wardenship of the east marches, while he ordered him in Henry's name to remain in the north "for the repressing and subduing of our rebels there and for the stablishing of the same country in our obeissance."[5] The privy seal was transferred to John Hales, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, since Rotherham, like Stillington, was in sanctuary; and as the Earl of Worcester had fled from London, taking a large sum of money with him, the treasurership was given to the Prior of St. John's.[1] But the Earl of Oxford, who had been one of Warwick's chief helpmates, received no special office, and the Earl of Pembroke was expected to be content with the recovery of his earldom. About the first of November, or a little earlier, Jasper Tudor came up to London, by the king's order, and brought with him his nephew, the fourteen year old Henry Tudor, whom he had found in the household of the widow of William Herbert, late Earl of Pembroke; but though, according to the well-known story told by Polydore Vergil, King Henry, with the peculiar prescience sometimes granted to the feeble-minded, immediately recognized in young Henry Tudor the one "unto whom both we and our adversaries must yield and give over the dominion," Warwick dared not anger Clarence by taking the lordship of Richmond from him in order to give it back to Henry Tudor. About 14th November Pembroke "returned homeward" with a commission authorizing him to take into custody for the king all the possessions of the late Earl of Pembroke in Wales and the marches, and his nephew went with him.[2]

---

[1] The proclamation protecting the sanctuaries, soon to be cited, was issued in Henry's name by "George, Duke of Clarence and Earl of Richmond" and by "Richard, Earl of Warwick and Salisbury, great chamberlain of England, captain of Calais, and lieutenant to our sovereign lord, King Henry the Sixth." Warwick took the title of high admiral on 2nd January. Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 233.

[2] Ellis, Original Letters, Series II, Vol. I, 139; Chastellain, V, 494.

[3] Writs of Privy Seal, file 780, no. 11062; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 243; Rymer, XI, 693.

[4] See a warrant for the payment of his salary of £200 a year. Warrants for Issues, 49 Hen. VI, 12th Dec.

[5] *Ibid.*, 26th Oct.; Rymer, XI, 665.

All the justices and all the barons of the Exchequer were reappointed on 9th October, and so were all the sheriffs of England. Even Edward's attorney, Henry Sotill, and his sergeants-at-law, Guy Fairfax, Richard Pygot, and John Catesby, were retained in Henry's service.[3] But there were a few minor offices which could be distributed among those whose loyalty to the house of Lancaster seemed to call for recognition. The remunerative office of master and worker of the king's mints in England and Calais, which Lord Hastings had held from the beginning of Edward's reign, was given to Sir Richard Tunstall,[4] and that of keeper of the Great Wardrobe fell to the grocer, Sir John Plummer, who, in December, was assigned £13,531 16*s.* a year for the expenses of his office but evidently found that amount too little, as in February it was increased by £220 6*s.* 8*d.*[1] Plummer's name might well have suggested to Warwick that of one who had suffered still more at Edward's hands, the mercer, Sir Thomas Cook; but though at the special behest of Henry and his council Cook's aldermanry was restored to him, he obtained no royal office except, perhaps, that of customer in the port of Southampton.[2]

---

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 229, 233; Rymer, Kingsford's London Chron., Three Fif. Cent. Chron., and Stow, *ut sup.*; Vespasiano da Bisticci, Vite di Uomini Illustri del Secolo XV, I, 324-325.

[2] Vergil (Camden Society), 134-135; Warrants for Issues, 49 Hen. VI, 3rd and 9th Nov.; Fine Roll 49 Hen. VI, m. 7, 14th Nov.

[3] Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 229; Rymer, XI, 663-664; Fine Roll 49 Hen. VI, m. 19; Warrants for Issues, 49 Hen. VI, 28th Feb.

[4] Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 227. Cf. Writs of Privy Seal, file 781, no. 11110, and Close Roll 49 Hen. VI, m. 3-4 dorso. Angels, angelets, and quarter nobles were struck during Henry's readeption. Kenyon, Gold Coins of Eng., 52-55; Waurin, III, 52.

Georges Chastellain depicts the months of Warwick's supremacy in England as a sort of reign of terror. He declares that the earl was guilty of cruel outrages in London, especially against the great merchants and others who were known to favour the fugitive Edward, and that there was no order or justice anywhere in the kingdom.[3] But Chastellain, being a Burgundian, was hardly an impartial judge of Warwick's acts, and the facts, so far as we know them, instead of supporting his statement, go to show that the earl did his best to preserve law and order and manifested a desire to conciliate his opponents rather than to wreak vengeance on them. The proclamation the earl issued at the moment of his landing in England was a praiseworthy effort to check lawless acts on the part of his men, and the first step he took after his arrival in London was to order his mistaken friends, the Kentishmen, to go back to their homes.[4] It is true that the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Duke of Norfolk, the Earls of Essex and Wiltshire, Lords Cromwell and Mountjoy, and some other prominent men were placed under arrest, but they were soon at liberty again; and even Sir Richard Woodville, who, unlike his brother Rivers, had not run away with the king, was given a pardon in a few weeks.[5] In fact, the entries on the Pardon Roll indicate that a general pardon was offered before 18th December. And certainly those who had taken refuge in the sanctuaries were left in peace. A proclamation which purported to come from King Henry strictly forbade any man on pain of death to "defoul or distrouble" the churches or sanctuaries or to vex, rob, or injure any person in them "for any manner cause or quarrel, old or new";[1] and no one benefited by this proclamation more than Queen Elizabeth, who, much as Warwick disliked her and all her kin, was allowed to remain, safe and undisturbed, in the Westminster sanctuary and to receive from a London butcher half a beef and two muttons a week "for the sustentation of her household." More than that, as the queen's confinement was known to be near at hand, Elizabeth, Lady Scrope, was appointed by Henry's council to wait upon her and was given a reward of ten pounds for doing so.[2] On 2nd November Elizabeth Woodville, to whom Heaven had granted only daughters in the years of her haughty prosperity, gave birth to a son in the sanctuary, and though it is said the child was christened "without pomp," the ceremony took place in Westminster Abbey with the abbot and prior of Westminster for godfathers and Lady Scrope for godmother. The advent of Edward IV's son into the world, giving to England a second Edward, Prince of Wales, was treated as a matter of small consequence by Warwick and his friends, but by those whose hearts clung to the absent father it was hailed as a happy omen.[3]

---

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 228, 232, 237; Writs of Privy Seal, file 780, nos. 11058, 11092.

[2] London Journal 7, f. 225-225b; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 347.

[3] Chastellain, V, 489-490.

[4] London Journal 7, f. 224b.

[5] Gerhard von Wesel's letter, Hanserecesse, II, 6, p. 416; Pardon Roll 49 Hen. VI; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 228. On 16th November Mountjoy and his wife, Anne, Duchess of Buckingham, were regranted the custody of the Buckingham estates. Fine Roll 49 Hen. VI, m. 8. Norfolk and Essex were summoned to parliament when the writs were sent out in October.

Over against Warwick's efforts to maintain law and order, his liberal use of the royal pardon, and his compassion, or at least forbearance, towards a queen who had little reason to look for kindness from him, is to be set, apparently, but one bloody deed. He had given notice of his intention to punish "such certain covetous and seditious persons as have guided and been about the estate royal of the realm," but against only one of Edward's ministers was the threat actually carried out, and in that case popular clamour probably had more to do with the matter than Warwick's thirst for vengeance.[4] The Earl of Worcester had been captured a day or two after his flight from London in a tree in a Huntingdonshire forest, and the night after Warwick entered the city he was brought to the Tower. That the "butcher of England," whom everyone hated, would be put to death was taken for granted, and on 12th October John Paston wrote that the earl was "like to die this day or to-morrow at the farthest."[1] But apparently it was not until the 15th that he was arraigned at Westminster before the Earl of Oxford—the earl whose father and brother he had sentenced to death eight years before—found guilty of treason, and sentenced to go "upon his feet" from Westminster to Tower Hill, there to be beheaded. The execution was to take place two days later, but as the earl was going to his doom, so many angry people gathered in the streets to express their detestation of him that the sheriffs were "fain to turn into the Fleet and there to borrow gaol for him for the night." On the following afternoon, under the protection of a large armed guard, he was taken from the Fleet and at last led to the place of execution. One of several priests who accompanied him to the scaffold, an Italian Dominican, upbraided him for his cruelty, especially in putting to death two little children—meaning, no doubt, the Earl of Desmond's sons—but the doomed man answered that what he had done he did for the state and then, turning to the headsman, begged him to perform his task, not with one blow, but with three, in honour of the Trinity. The headsman granted the pious request, and when all was over, the earl's body was given honourable burial in a chapel in the Blackfriars' church which he himself had founded.[2]

---

[1] Harleian MS. 543, f. 172.

[2] Writs of Privy Seal, file 838, no. 3417 (Ellis, Original Letters, Series II, Vol. I, 140); Warrants for Issues, 49 Hen. VI, 30th Oct. Cf. Scofield, Eng. Hist. Review, Jan., 1909, p. 9.

[3] Fabyan, 659-660; Kingsford's London Chron., 183; Hist. Croy. Cont., 554. The chronicles disagree in regard to the date of the birth of Edward's son, but all doubt is removed by a grant made to the Prince of the issues of the duchy of Cornwall from Michaelmas 10 Edw. IV till 2nd November following, "on which day he was born." Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 365.

[4] Cf. Vespasiano da Bisticci.

Some years later, when printing Worcester's translation of *Tully on Friendship*, William Caxton wrote of him that he "flowered in virtue and cunning to whom I knew none like among the lords of the temporality in science and moral virtue," and again, when printing the earl's translation of the *Orations of Cornelius Scipio and Gayus Flamineus*, recommended to the prayers of all who read the book the soul of one who, with great labour, had made a pilgrimage to the holy places of Jerusalem, who had enjoyed great honour at Rome, and who had faced death so bravely that "every man that was there might learn to die and take his death patiently: wherein I hope and doubt not but that God received his soul into His everlasting bliss."[3] But in spite of Caxton's generous praise, it is to be feared that few mourned and many rejoiced when that ornament to scholarship and literature, John Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester, passed out of the world.

---

[1] Paston Letters, V, 85.

[2] Fabyan, 659; Kingsford's London Chron., 182-183; Warkworth, 13; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 183; Vespasiano da Bisticci, I, 325-326; Sharpe, I, 312; London Journal 7, f. 225; Inquisitions *post mortem*, 9 and 10 Edw. IV, no. 53. Worcester's widow promptly married Sir William Stanley. Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 297.

[3] Blades, The Life and Typography of William Caxton, I, 162-164.

All things considered, then, Warwick deserves credit for the forbearance he showed in his days of power. Whether he proved himself a wise statesman is another question, and unfortunately the answer in this case cannot be favourable to him, as it is evident from the course he essayed to take with reference to France and Burgundy that he either lacked understanding of England's needs and real desires or else allowed his ambition and resentment and the ties with which he had bound himself to the king of France to override his judgment, even his common sense.

Warkworth says that, although when Henry of Lancaster was deposed in 1461 all England was "full glad to have a change," that was only "because of his false lords and never of him" and because the people thought "if they might have another king," he would recover all that had been lost in France in Henry's day and "amend all manner of things that was amiss and bring the realm of England in great prosperity and rest." And in 1470, the same writer declares, Henry was welcomed back to his throne not only by his "good lovers," but by "the more part of people" for the reason that Edward's reign had given England, not the looked-for good things, but, instead, "one battle after another and much trouble and great loss of goods among the common people, as first the fifteenth of all their goods, and then an whole fifteenth, and yet at every battle to come far out their countries at their own cost; and these and such other brought England right low, and many men said that King Edward had much blame for hurting merchandise, for in his days they were not in other lands, nor within England, taken in such reputation and credence as they were afore."

In other words, the grievances that made Edward's subjects ready for another "change" and that Warwick must try to remove were civil war, burdensome taxation, failure to recover the lost possessions in France, and the "hurting" of merchandise—by which is probably to be understood the continued exclusion of English cloth and yarn from Burgundy and the annulment of the retaliatory act of parliament forbidding the importation of Burgundian products into England. But that the restoration of Henry VI would bring internal peace to England was too much to hope for. Much more likely was it to prove the cause of another period of bloody civil war, as Edward, in spite of his flight, had not renounced the crown and as the Duke of Burgundy was almost sure to give him assistance sooner or later. Nor was the hope of relief from burdensome taxation much brighter. The Yorkist party too had been loud at one time in expressions of sympathy for the taxpayer, and loud in its denunciations of the graspingness and bad management of the crown's ministers; yet England had found that with the accession of a Yorkist king taxes did not grow lighter, and she was likely to discover again that a change of dynasty was no cure. If Sir John Fortescue's advice was remembered and followed, something might be gained for a time, but there could be no lasting improvement in the matter of taxation until the kingdom was at peace and until parliament had learned the need of providing the king with money in the safe and legitimate way, with effective checks and safeguards, in order to prevent him from helping himself to it by illegitimate and unsafe ways.

If it was beyond Warwick's power to give England internal peace and to make the taxpayer happy, the restoration of the lost possessions in France was equally impossible for him. For how could he make war on Louis XI when it was Louis who had made possible his return to England and the recrowning of Henry VI? Indeed, war with France was farthest from Warwick's wish or intention. His bitterest quarrel with Edward had grown out of Edward's determination to accept an alliance with Burgundy instead of the alliance with France which he had urged upon him; and anyone who thought that his advent to power would not mean a reversal of Edward's foreign policy must have been speedily undeceived, as one of the first things he did after his return was to order the seizure of all goods belonging to subjects of the Duke of Burgundy.[1] An alliance with Louis against Charles must mean the renunciation of England's claims in France, and yet it was evident that Warwick had bound himself to enter into such alliance and that, by some extraordinary course of reasoning, he had brought himself to believe that England would rather face such a sacrifice than endure longer the humiliation of being bound to an ally who refused to receive English cloth and yarn! How great was his error of judgment events were to show.

By 26th September Louis was rejoicing over Warwick's safe arrival in England and giving orders that all Englishmen belonging to the earl's party were to be shown every courtesy; and very soon he received a letter which Warwick had written two days after entering London and in which the earl, improving on the truth a little, told him that, thanks to God's aid and to his, the whole realm of England had submitted to Henry VI and the usurper Edward had been driven out.[1] Louis was so jubilant that he ordered a three days' holiday and processions and solemn masses in all the chief towns and churches of France, and on 14th October proclaimed in Paris the alliance he had signed with Margaret of Anjou.[2] About the same time, too, he invited English merchants adhering to Henry and Warwick to come to France, promising to treat them with as much favour as if they were his own subjects and even to excuse them for two years from the payment of all the customary tolls and other charges.[3] He also began to get a fleet ready and to make arrangements to send some supplies to Calais, where, despite the treatment Warwick had received when luck was going against him, in less than a quarter of an hour after it was known that he had triumphed every man, with the exception of Duras and a few others, had donned his badge of the ragged staff. So complete was the change of feeling in Calais that Wenlock renounced the pension he had been offered by Charles by declaring war on Burgundy in the name of Henry and Warwick.[4]

---

[1] Chronique Scandaleuse, I, 247-248.

The first story which reached the Duke of Burgundy's ears after Warwick landed in England was that Edward had been killed, and serious as the results of Edward's death were likely to be, this disturbed Charles less than the later and truer news that the king of England was still alive and had arrived in Holland. Commynes, who chanced to come back from Calais the very day it became known that Edward was at Alkmaar, found Charles much agitated and very uncertain what he ought to do. Edward was not only his wife's brother but a knight of the Golden Fleece, and he himself wore the Garter. On the other hand, Henry VI was his blood kinsman, and so kindly did he still feel towards the house of Lancaster that to this day he had permitted the Dukes of Somerset and Exeter and other friends of Henry and Margaret to stay at

[1] Lettres de Louis XI, IV, 143-144; Waurin, III, 43-44, note.

[2] Quicherat, Documents hist. inédits tirés des collections manuscrites de la Bibliothèque Royale, etc., I, 683-684; Chronique Scandaleuse, *ut sup.* Cf. Lettres de Louis XI, IV, 152-154, and Chastellain, V, 487.

[3] See Louis' instructions to his ambassadors going to England, Waurin, III, 196-204.

[4] Chastellain, V, 488, 490; Commynes, I, 212-213.

his court.[1] He felt, too, that Edward's ability to regain his throne was doubtful, and in the meantime he feared Warwick and the league of England and France against Burgundy which he knew Warwick must have promised Louis.

Charles's quandary lasted several days, and then he decided to try a rather curious bit of strategy. The day after Gruthuyse brought Edward to the Hague the duke bestowed a pension of five hundred crowns a month on the king,[2] but at the same time he sent Commynes back to Calais, with one or two of the friends of Henry VI who were at his court, to say that he was "très joyeux et content" that God had seen fit to restore his kinsman, Henry of Lancaster, to the throne of England, that he desired the continuance of the existing treaty between England and Burgundy, and that he was ready to be friends with all persons whom King Henry regarded as his loyal subjects. He also sent a letter to Calais expressing his surprise at the news that a large number of armed men were being sent over from England to Calais; for though he was taking steps to guard his frontiers, he was doing so, he explained, not because he had any thought of attacking Calais or because he believed that the English had any thought of attacking him, but only because he feared that those who were in charge at Calais would find it difficult to keep so many troops in order.[3] In short, he wanted the English to understand that he had no wish to pick a quarrel with them just because they had turned out his brother-in-law Edward for the sake of his blood kinsman Henry, and that, if war came, the whole responsibility for it would rest on the shoulders of the Earl of Warwick, the catspaw of the king of France.

Commynes had not gone far on his way towards Calais before he met frightened people fleeing before Warwick's men, who were already making a raid into the county of Boulogne; and though he had been in the habit of going to Calais quite freely, he became so alarmed that even when Charles, to whom he reported the state of things, sent him a ring to use as a token and told him to go on, as he would ransom him if the English imprisoned him (an order which caused the frightened gentleman to make some sarcastic remarks in his *Mémoires* about Charles's readiness to sacrifice his servants), he was afraid to proceed farther without a safeconduct from Wenlock.

[1] Commynes, I, 205, 211.

[2] Commynes-Lenglet, II, 196.

[3] *Ibid.*, IV, 416-418; Plancher, IV, cclxxxix; Commynes-Dupont, III, 271-272.

When Wenlock sent him the safeconduct and gracious letters besides, he took courage to enter the English pale, but he noticed that the captain of Guines, while offering him wine and showing much attention to the friends of King Henry who had come with him, did not invite him into the castle as in the past, and that at Calais too he failed to receive the wonted courtesies. Neither did it escape his eye that everyone in Calais was wearing Warwick's badge, or that on the door of his lodgings some one had drawn white crosses, the rallying token of the French, and scribbled some rhymes the sentiment of which was that the king of France and the Earl of Warwick were one;[1] and although Wenlock invited him to dinner and used the occasion to make excuses for Warwick and himself, he observed that those who formerly talked loudest in favour of King Edward now talked loudest against him. This might be due to fear in some cases but in others, he thought, those who condemned Edward were expressing their real feelings. However, Commynes himself was not the soul of honesty. No one knew better than he that Edward was safe in Holland, and yet he went about declaring that he had positive knowledge that the king was dead, adding, however, that whether he was dead or alive was of no consequence, as the Duke of Burgundy's alliance was with the king and kingdom of England, not with Edward personally, and that whomsoever the English accepted for their king the duke would accept also. He nearly got himself into trouble by sending orders to Gravelines for the arrest of all English merchants there until satisfaction had been given for the plundering recently done in Boulogne, but when a promise was given that all the stolen cattle should be either restored or paid for, the storm blew over, and before he left Calais, he declares, he succeeded in obtaining a promise of the continuance of the alliance between England and Burgundy without other change than the substitution of Henry's name for Edward's.[2]

From Commynes' narrative one might think at first that his clever lies were all that saved the Duke of Burgundy from being attacked as soon as Warwick had established himself in England. It is only at the end of his story that he remarks that the great merchants of London helped largely to bring about the *appointement* between Warwick and Charles. Yet the opposition of the staplers to a war with Burgundy must have had far more weight with Warwick than anything the wily Commynes could say; for the staplers, who supplied the money that paid the garrison, held the whip handle at Calais. In any case, Warwick very soon began to see that it was not going to be as easy a matter as he had thought to lead England into war with Burgundy, and if he did not actually go so far as to promise the continuance of the alliance between England and Burgundy, as Commynes would have us believe, at least he allowed King Henry to send one Master Robert Gaseley, doctor of divinity, to Charles "in our message."[1]

---

[1] Some interesting political poems in which Louis XI, Warwick, and Charles the Bold figure are printed in Le Roux de Lincy's *Chants historiques et populaires*.

[2] Commynes, I, 210-214.

But Warwick, if baulked for the moment, did not abandon his intention of bringing about an alliance between England and France. Louis had sent a herald to him to say that he was going to send an embassy to England soon,[2] and while waiting for the coming of Louis' ambassadors, with whose help he hoped to be able to accomplish what he seemed to be unable to do alone, the earl busied himself with some negotiations with the king of Castile, probably with the thought that, if he could recover the lost alliance with Castile, that would help to win the good-will of the merchants and thus serve as one step towards the alliance with France. In October Henry the Impotent had promised to give the hand of his daughter to Louis' brother, and at the close of the month he ordered his subjects to make war on the English.[3] But the order of 30th October must have been rescinded immediately when it was learned that a change of kings had been effected in England through Louis' instrumentality; for on 15th November the chancellor of England was directed to issue a proclamation stating that, as it seemed desirable to the king and his council that ships of Spain should be allowed to come to England "to the intent that merchandise may the more abundantly have course and exercise in this our realm," the Earl of Warwick, to whom had been committed the keeping of the sea, was to have full authority to grant under his seal as many letters of safeconduct of a year's duration to Spaniards coming to the port of London, to Calais, and to all other places "from thence westward" as he might think necessary and expedient.[1] Friendly relations having thus been renewed with Castile, shortly after an envoy from Henry the Impotent, Johannes de Lucena, arrived in England to seek reparation for some Spanish merchants who had been robbed off the coast of England. This may have been done by the Bastard of Fauconberg, who was guarding the sea for Warwick and who, if he was not responsible for this attack on the Spanish merchants, at least distinguished himself a few months later (March, 1471) by capturing a number of Portuguese ships which were returning home richly laden from Flanders and, considering the ancient friendship between England and Portugal, ought to have had nothing to fear from any Englishman.[2] The "Doctor de Lucena" found Warwick gracious and attentive to what he had to say, and the Spanish merchants whose cause he had come to plead were promised reparation within a year, provided their complaints were found to be well grounded and provided the king of Spain would undertake to give similar satisfaction to English merchants injured by his subjects.[3]

---

[1] Warrants for Issues, 49 Hen. VI, 12th November—an order to pay Gaseley £20 for his expenses. Gaseley, who was a member of the order of the Preaching Friars, carried a letter from Henry VI to the convocation of Canterbury in May, 1460, and he is no doubt identical with the Master Robert Glaselay mentioned as a Friar Preacher in Cambridge in 1457. Wilkins, III, 577; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 339.

[2] Louis' instructions to his ambassadors, Waurin, *ut sup.*

[3] Daumet, 114; Calmette, 314, note.

Warwick was busy with other matters also while he was waiting for the arrival of Louis' ambassadors, as on 26th November parliament met at Westminster in response to a summons which had been sent out two days after the crown was replaced on the head of Henry of Lancaster.[4] The official records of this parliament of Henry's readeption have disappeared, but the chronicles state that the Archbishop of York took for the text of his opening address, "Turn, O backsliding children, saith the Lord, for I am married unto you," and that the acts passed included one which declared

---

[1] Writs of Privy Seal, file 780, no. 11035; French Roll 49 Hen. VI, m. 8.

[2] For this exploit of the Bastard, see Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV, 33, and the commission afterwards given by the king of Portugal to John d'Elvas sent to England to demand reparation. Rymer, XI, 763. According to this commission, the Bastard made his attack on the Portuguese ships in March, 1471, although according to the commission which Edward gave to certain ones to investigate the matter (Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 379), it was made in the ninth year of his reign.

[3] Rymer, XI, 671-676; French Roll 49 Hen. VI, m. 6; Warrants for Issues, 49 Hen. VI, 17th Dec.—a warrant to pay £100 to "the Doctor de Lucena, orator of the king of Sicily now being here and pursuing the said restitution." "Sicily" must be a slip of the pen for Castile, yet curiously enough in one of the documents printed by Rymer Johannes de Lucena is again described as "doctor et orator serenissimi Principis Ispaniæ Regis Siciliæ." In after years, as we shall see, he came to England as the ambassador of the king of Aragon.

[4] Reports touching Dignity of a Peer, IV, 976-979.

Edward IV to have been an usurper, annulled all the acts of parliament of his reign, and attainted him, his brother Gloucester, and all his closest friends; and another which entailed the crown upon Henry VI and his heirs male or, Henry's heirs failing, upon the Duke of Clarence and his heirs male.[1] Warwick was also accepted as Henry's lieutenant and protector of the realm, with Clarence as his associate, and Clarence was recognised as the heir of his father, the late Duke of York. We are told, too, that the Marquis of Montagu received a pardon after he had made a long speech in which he declared that fear and only fear had kept him faithful to Edward so long, and finally, that Sir Thomas Cook petitioned to have his losses, which he estimated at twenty-two thousand marks, made good to him. Cook would probably have secured what he wanted, Fabyan thinks, if King Henry had prospered, as he was "of the Common House and therewith a man of great boldness in speech and well spoken and singularly witted and well reasoned."[2]

Parliament continued to sit, after an adjournment to St. Paul's, until Christmas, and it met again in January, as we shall see, for special business.[3] But almost immediately after it assembled the French ambassadors at last arrived, and thereupon Warwick's attention became quite as much absorbed by the negotiations with Louis as by the important things parliament was doing. The men Louis had chosen to send to England were Louis d'Harcourt, Bishop of Bayeux, William Monypenny, Seigneur de Concressault, Tanguy du Chastel, a man who had been at one time the ablest councillor of Francis II of Brittany, Ivon du Fou, Doctor Nicolas Michel, a canon of Bayeux, and Guillaume de Cerisay, registrar of the parliament of Paris; and he had given them their commissions and instructions as early as 13th November.[4] That they had not arrived in England sooner was probably due to Louis' hope that Margaret of Anjou and her son and the Countess of Warwick would make the journey with them. But though Louis was so anxious to have her go, Margaret was still afraid to trust herself and her son in her husband's so recently and so suddenly recovered kingdom,

[1] Cf. Rolls of Parl., VI, 194.

[2] Warkworth, 12-13; Fabyan, 660; Kingsford's London Chron., 183; Vergil, 662; Hall, 286.

[3] The chronicles are silent about this January session, but see the Bishop of Bayeux's letter of 6th February which will soon be quoted, and compare Stonor Letters and Papers, I, 117.

[4] Rymer, XI, 667; Waurin, III, 196-204.

and in the end Louis had had to consent to keep her and her son under his wing a little longer. When his ambassadors reported that all was well, she would go.[1]

The first messages Louis' ambassadors had been told to deliver to Warwick were that the king of France thanked him for the kindness he had shown to French subjects since his success, that he regarded him as the best friend he had in the world, even as his "propre père," and that nothing in the world could possibly induce him to desert him or his cause. They had also been instructed to tell the earl of the steps Louis had taken to help him, of the orders the king had given the moment he received the earl's letter for the fitting out of a fleet and for the sending of supplies to Calais from Normandy, and of the special favours he had offered to English merchants adhering to the earl's party; and they were to add that Louis was ready and willing to do all the things that had been talked over at Angers, especially to enter into alliance with whomsoever Warwick might advise. But of course the reward Louis was expecting for all this loving kindness was the assistance against Burgundy which he had been promised; and his ambassadors had also been empowered to conclude with King Henry, to whom they brought polite letters and messages extolling Warwick's services to him, an alliance against the Duke of Burgundy so firmly secured that neither signatory could sign a peace or truce with the duke without the consent of the other or lay down his arms until every inch of the duke's territories had been conquered. Louis had even authorized his ambassadors to discuss the division of the spoils and to suggest that Warwick should take as his personal share Holland and Zealand. He also wanted them to reach an understanding as to just how the war was to be conducted. His own idea was that each king should pay his own soldiers, and he outlined three possible plans of campaign. According to the first, the English were to land in the *pays de Caux* to join his army and march with it against Charles; according to the second, he was to advance against Picardy, while Warwick and the English were to land at Calais and advance towards St. Omer supported by five or six hundred lances he would send to meet them; according to the third, he was to send one army towards Compiègne and Noyon and another through the *pays de Caux* while Warwick marched from Calais in the direction of St. Omer. Louis also desired a decision

[1] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 144.

in regard to the size of the armies to be put into the field and in regard to the very day the war was to begin, and finally, he wanted Warwick to send him all the proofs he could find of Charles's treaties and conspiracies with Edward against France, especially since the treaty of Peronne. Any letters signed by Charles or his secretaries or sealed with his seal, or any letters from any other of Louis' subjects, would be useful material.[1]

Such an alliance as this against Burgundy was probably no more than Warwick had promised at Angers, and it was but natural that Louis should want to hasten the attack on Charles as much as possible. But Louis had not forgotten the lesson he had been taught several years before when he thought that to win Warwick was to win England. He was quite as conscious as Warwick himself could be of the difficulties that lay in the way of carrying out the programme which he and the earl had mapped out. Indeed, he seems to have realized even better than Warwick how strong the opposition in England would be ; for he had charged his ambassadors to ask Warwick for the names of the great men of England whose goodwill must be courted and for suggestions as to how those men could most easily be induced to approve and support the war against Burgundy, whether by promising them gifts of land in the conquered territories or by some other means.[2] More than that, he laid a trap for the merchants of England, whose power he had already acknowledged by the extraordinary inducements he had hastened to hold out to them to join Warwick's party and to visit French shores. At his request Jean de Beaune, a wealthy cloth merchant of Tours who had just supplied the money necessary to obtain from Rome the dispensation for the marriage of the Prince of Wales and Anne Neville,[3] and Jean Briçonnet, Beaune's son-in-law and receiver general for Langue d'oil, had collected spices, cloth of gold, silks, linens, and other attractive kinds of merchandise purchasable in the markets of France, to the value of twenty-five thousand crowns or thereabouts, and when the Bishop of Bayeux and his colleagues appeared in London, Briçonnet and Jean de Beaune's son and the twenty-five thousand crowns' worth of merchandise, quite unexpectedly to Warwick, it would seem, appeared with them. The spices and cloth of gold and silks and linens were not meant for gifts for King Henry or his faithful henchman, the

[1] Waurin, *ut sup.*

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Lettres de Louis XI, III, 151, note.

Earl of Warwick. They were intended to astonish the merchants of England, to make them see, as Louis expressed it, that "les marchans de France estoient puissans pour les fournir comme les autres nacions."[1]

Whether it was success or disappointment that the future held in store for Louis' schemes, at least he could make no complaint about the reception given to his ambassadors in England. "His Majesty has received a reply from his ambassadors who went to England," Bettini told the Duke of Milan on 19th December. "Words fail them to express the honourable and noble way in which they have been received and welcomed, so they state in their letters to the king, both by the king there and the Earl of Warwick principally, and then by all the other lords and the people of England with a marvellous demonstration of love and affection towards his Majesty. In this they seem more persistent every day, expressing their readiness to take up quickly and promptly any plan conceived or suggested by his Majesty, especially against the Duke of Burgundy, for which they show the utmost enthusiasm."[2]

If the glowing report from his ambassadors did not remove all Louis' doubts, at least it enabled him to convince Margaret of Anjou that the time had come for her and her son to follow Warwick to England; and after the Prince of Wales had given him a written promise that he would assist in the war against Burgundy until Charles was overthrown and all his territories conquered and that he would urge King Henry to declare war,[3] Louis bade the queen and her son godspeed. On 14th December Margaret and the Prince, with the Prince's wife, or fiancée, and the Countess of Warwick, left Amboise for Paris, where they were received with elaborate display, and from Paris they went soon after to Rouen.[4] In the meantime word had been sent to England that they were ready to come, and evidently Warwick planned to go to France himself to escort them, as on 17th December the officers of the Exchequer were commanded to pay him two thousand pounds because the king had delegated him "with an army of ships and men to pass into the parties of France for the bringing home of our most dear and entirely beloved wife, the queen, and of our son, the Prince."[1] But though the endorsements on this warrant show that Warwick received piecemeal not only the two thousand pounds, but nearly ninety pounds above that amount, he did not cross the sea for Margaret, and she, as her escort failed to arrive, could only stay where she was.

---

[1] M. de Maulde, "Un essai d'exposition internationale en 1470," Acad. des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 4 série, tome XVII, 183-189.

[2] Cal. Milanese Papers, *ut sup.*

[3] Plancher, IV, ccxcii; Waurin, III, 41-45; Basin, II, 228-230, 247. A copy of this compact was found among the Prince's effects after the battle of Tewkesbury and Edward sent it to Charles. Basin II, 273-274.

[4] Lettres de Louis XI, IV, 171; Chronique Scandaleuse, I, 249-250; a letter from Bruges printed in The Genealogist, New Series, III, 65; Inventaire-Sommaire des archives départementales antérieures à 1790, Seine-Inférieure, II, 236. Cf. Bettini's letter.

The truth seems to be that Warwick had his hands full and was afraid to leave his post even for a few days. One of his difficulties was the ever recurring one of need of money. A few days after he reached London the mayor and aldermen had promised him a loan of a hundred pounds until Easter for his own use, and the common council had agreed to let him have a loan of a thousand pounds for the king; but the grant from the common council was made specifically for the defence of Calais, and not only did the earl fail to get further loans, but the city authorities began to clamour for the repayment of a thousand pounds which they had advanced to him and Clarence after the battle of Edgecott.[2] Then he had also to contend with the outspoken opposition of the merchants to a war with Burgundy. The effect of the rich cargo which Messieurs Briçonnet and Beaune had brought was not at all what the king of France had expected and desired. Instead of thrilling the merchants of England with the thought of the wonderful opportunities awaiting them in France, the spices and cloth of gold, the silks and linens, seem to have excited their ire, as Warwick had to require the French ambassadors to forbid Briçonnet to sell or otherwise distribute these wares without his express consent.[3] And in addition to all the rest, there was the knowledge that Edward was safe at the Hague. So far, as Master Robert Gaseley may have reported, the Duke of Burgundy had avoided a meeting with his brother-in-law, leaving the courtesies to the hospitable Gruthuyse;[4] but there was not a shadow of a doubt that, at the first sign of an alliance between England and France, Charles would begin to cast about for some means of restoring Edward to his throne. And if Charles's aid should enable Edward to return, as Louis' aid had enabled Warwick, what would England, fickle, not sure which king she liked the better, do then? Already, apparently, there were rumours that before

[1] Warrants for Issues, 49 Hen. VI, 17th Dec.; Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 150.

[2] London Journal 7, ff. 225, 230b-231.

[3] M. de Maulde, *ut sup.*

[4] La Marche, III, 237.

long Edward would be coming; for on 21st December the Marquis of Montagu was authorized to array the men of the northern counties, and a week later a commission was issued to Warwick himself, with Clarence, Oxford, and Scrope of Bolton, to raise troops for the defence of the realm against the king's enemies.[1] But there was no hope of keeping Edward out unless England wanted him kept out, and if England had set her face against the alliance with France and the war with Burgundy which Warwick was obviously trying to draw her into, and could not be persuaded to change her mind, she would turn from Henry and open her arms to Edward again.

Warwick was tripping over still another stumbling-block, the disappointment of Clarence. Of this danger he may have been less fearful than the circumstances warranted, as he knew nothing about the promise Clarence had made to the lady who passed by Calais while Commynes was there or, probably, of the efforts constantly put forth in England by the duke's mother, his sisters, the Duchesses of Exeter and Suffolk, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Bath, and the Earl of Essex, and in Burgundy by the Duchess of Burgundy and Lord Hastings, to effect a reconciliation between Edward and his brother.[2] But at least Warwick knew that Clarence was watching jealously and suspiciously every move he made, and the knowledge was not calculated to give him ease of mind.

Louis' ambassadors must have guessed Warwick's troubles, as the slow progress their negotiations with him made was enough in itself to reveal the state of things. Nevertheless, they were still confident that it was only a matter of a short time until they would get all they wanted. In a letter which Monypenny wrote from London on 19th January to Pierre d'Oriole, Louis' *général des finances*, he not only gave another enthusiastic account of the reception which had been extended to him and his companions in England, but expressed the hope that very soon their mission would be fulfilled to the entire satisfaction of the king of France and of all his loyal subjects and good friends. They were already engaged, he wrote, in drawing up the truce and intercourse of merchandise, and as soon as that task was completed and Warwick's army ready, they would hurry home.[3] It was not until 6th February,

[1] Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 251; Rymer XI, 676-678.

[2] Arrivall of Edw. IV, 10; Hist. Croy. Cont., 554.

[3] Legrand collections, MS. français 6978, f. 47. Monypenny alludes to a

however, that the Bishop of Bayeux was able to inform Louis, on Warwick's authority, that a ten years' truce had been granted by King Henry and the English parliament and, what was much more important, that an alliance against Edward and the Duke of Burgundy had been agreed to with the understanding that neither party was to make peace with the enemy without the consent of the other. Warwick that very day, the bishop declared, was sending orders to Calais to begin the war, and within ten or twelve days two or three thousand men would be dispatched to that stronghold. Orders had already gone forth, he stated further, for the assembling of a large army, including eight or ten thousand archers *d'élite*, or, as they were called in England, archers *de maison*—a force considered to be worth more than twenty thousand ordinary troops —and of this army Warwick himself would take command and would convey it across the sea within the time Louis had named. Warwick also approved, the bishop said, of Louis' suggestions in regard to how the Duke of Burgundy's territories were to be divided up and of his wish that the war of conquest should be waged to a finish. As for the fleet, that was even now ready to sail, and it consisted of such fine ships filled with so many men that, when it was united with Louis' own fleet, the sea would unquestionably belong to the king of France "pour cette saison." The written agreements had already been engrossed, though the bishop confessed that to get them passed through parliament, which, he said, had assembled for the purpose only a few days before he wrote, had taken more time than all the rest. However, matters had now advanced so far that he and his colleagues were hoping to be able soon to mount their horses and set out for home.[1] One thing only still remained unsettled. Regarding the intercourse of merchandise, because it touched "tous les marchands du royaume," the bishop said, settlement had been deferred until representatives appointed by the towns could be sent to consult about it. "Mais ils disent," he added encouragingly, "que sans point de faute bientost ils y mettront fin à vostre entention."

longer letter which he was writing to Louis himself, but that letter I have been unable to find.

[1] "Nos escritures se grossoient pour lesquelles faire passer par le parlement, qui n'a esté que depuis peu de jour en ça du tout assemblé, avons mis plus de temps que à faire tout le demourant, mais tant y a esté en tout besongné que nous esperons pour toute cette sepmaine estre prests pour monter à cheval à nous en aller devers vous à la plus grande diligence que faire pourrons."

To the Bishop of Bayeux's letter Warwick added a note with his own hand. "Sire," wrote the earl to Louis, "je vous promets que tout ce que dessus est escrit sera tenu et parfait de point en point, et ainsy l'ay promis à messieurs les ambassadeurs, et vous verray dedans bref, se Dieu plaise, car c'est tout ce que je desire." And so precious did Louis' ambassadors consider this written promise from the earl that, for fear of its loss "en chemin," they kept the original letter to which it was attached and sent Louis a copy certified by two of their number, Michel and Cerisay, who declared that Warwick had written every word of his note with his own hand.[1]

But while Louis' ambassadors were feeling so happy, things were happening in Burgundy. The news that Louis had sent an embassy to England was all that was needed to stir Charles to action, and immediately he let it be known that he was ready to receive Edward. With the attentive Gruthuyse still in attendance, therefore, Edward set out from the Hague the day after Christmas, and on 2nd January Charles met him at Aire. There the brothers-in-law conferred together for two days, and after Charles departed the Duchess Margaret came to Aire, probably to talk with Edward about Clarence, who, in spite of his failings, had always been Margaret's favourite brother. Then, on the 7th, the king went to St. Pol, where he was the guest of Jacques de Luxembourg and where he had another interview with Charles.[2] But if Edward pleaded hard for help to recover his throne, the Dukes of Somerset and Exeter pleaded no less hard for King Henry, and on finding that Somerset and Exeter felt no more affection for Warwick than he did, Charles let the two dukes go back to England under the impression that the house of Lancaster, though not its present champion, could count on his friendship.[3] In reality, however, there was little choice left to Charles, as by this time, perhaps to force Warwick's hand, Louis had declared war and the Count of St. Pol had seized St. Quentin (6th January).;[4] So in the end the duke, although he made public announcement that no aid was to be given to Edward, sent his brother-in-law fifty thousand florins and began to take other steps to assist him.[5]

---

[1] Legrand collections, MS. français 6977, ff. 32-33.

[2] Van Praet, Recherches sur Louis de Bruges, Seigneur de la Gruthuyse, 10; Commynes, I, 215; Commynes-Lenglet, II, 197; Waurin, III, 55.

[3] Commynes, *ut sup.*

[4] Lettres de Louis XI, IV, 180; Waurin, III, 53; Commynes, I, 181, note 1.

[5] Commynes, I, 215.

Exeter reached London a week after the Bishop of Bayeux's letter was written and upon his arrival went at once "to Westminster to King Henry."[1] But it was useless to try to reach Henry's ear while Warwick was the real lord and master, and the alliance with France was already all but sealed. On the very day of Exeter's return a commission was given by authority of parliament to the Archbishop of York, Clarence, Warwick, the Prior of St. John's, and others to sign the compact with the French ambassadors, and three days later the ten years' truce and intercourse of merchandise between England and France, to which was appended an agreement that a diet to negotiate a treaty of peace should meet within three years, received the signatures of Louis' and of Henry's representatives.[2] However, the agreement relating to the war against Burgundy was still unannounced, if not still uncompleted. On 21st February Thomas Smyth, clerk in the office of the privy seal, was granted ten marks "for the entendance and labours that he hath had in writing of the truce and intercourse of merchandise and other appointments late taken betwixt us and our cousin Louis of France by his and our ambassadors, orators, and commissaries;"[3] but if the "other appointments" included the agreement for the annihilation of the Duke of Burgundy, that part of Smyth's work has disappeared. The only existing proofs that such an agreement was ever made by Warwick are the Bishop of Bayeux's letter and Warwick's note attached to it. Yet the earl had already taken up the task of raising an army for Louis' service, and he forced Briçonnet to yield up to him seventeen thousand crowns' worth of his glittering merchandise to help pay for it.[4]

Warwick may have postponed the announcement of his intention to assist the king of France to wage war on Burgundy because he expected Queen Margaret and the Prince of Wales to arrive in England soon and thought the announcement would meet with a better reception if it were made by the Prince than if it were made by himself. For though the earl no longer thought of crossing to France himself to escort the queen and the Prince, a day or two after the ten years' truce with France was signed the Prior of St. John's and others departed from Henry's court "for the fetching of our right dear and most entirely beloved wife, the queen, and the Prince, our son."[1] But though on 27th February Warwick started for Dover to welcome Margaret and the Prince, bad weather made the short voyage from France impossible and, after waiting some time in vain, the earl returned to London not only "without speed of his purpose," but to learn that in his absence Mayor John Stokton had suddenly taken to his bed. The mayor had been well enough to preside at meetings of the common council held on 19th and 21st February, but the day after Warwick departed for Dover he became so ill that for a week or more Richard Lee performed the duties of the mayoralty, with the title of king's lieutenant, and after that Sir Thomas Cook. The office of mayor of London was a highly honourable one but also a very responsible one, especially in times of civil war, and Stokton, having received a hint that King Edward was about to descend on England, preferred to "feign him sick."[2]

---

[1] Kingsford's London Chron., 183; Fabyan, 660.

[2] Rymer, XI, 681-690.

[3] Warrants for Issues, 49 Hen. VI, 21st Feb.

[4] Coventry Leet Book, II, 362; M. de Maulde, Acad. des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, *ut sup*. Edward afterwards sold to John di Bardi of Florence for £72 3*s*. 2*d*. "divers silks called velvets, damasks, satins, and camlets, lately belonging to divers French envoys." Receipt Roll, Easter 11 Edw. IV, no. 902.

Stokton soon had reason to congratulate himself on his foresight; for Warwick had not much more than returned from his useless journey to Dover when the story that King Edward was coming was confirmed. Instantly the earl hurried away to Warwickshire to raise men, while the Bishop of Bayeux and all his companions, suddenly feeling that they would be more comfortable, not to say safer, on the other side of the sea, made a dash for home in the night—not an altogether successful dash, however, as the Hansards were hovering about and the Duke of Brittany, moved by a letter of appeal which he had received from Edward in January by the hands of Jacques de Luxembourg,[3] had sent the Bastard of Brittany to sea. The Bretons captured one ship laden with English hackneys, plate, and other valuable belongings of the French ambassadors, while the son of Jean de Beaune and such of Briçonnet's wares as Warwick had not appropriated fell into the hands of the Hansards. Young Beaune lost his life as well as his costly cargo, and the king of France found himself obliged to pay the young man's father and Briçonnet an indemnity of thirty thousand livres.[1] Poor Louis! Thirty thousand of his precious livres gone, and with them such a charming vision of English merchants flocking to the fairs of France!

---

[1] Warrants for Issues, 49 Hen. VI, 16th Feb.; Rymer, XI, 693. The town of Lydd contributed £3 6*s*. 8*d*. "for the voyage of our lord the king for conducting back our lady the queen." Hist. MSS. Com., Report 5, app., 545.

[2] Kingsford's London Chron. and Fabyan, *ut sup.;* London Journal 7, f. 230 et seq.; London Journal 8, f. 3. These two London journals overlap each other in a curious way.

[3] Edward's letter to Francis has been printed in Facsimiles of Autographs in the Dept. of MSS. of the British Museum, Third Series, and in Bibl. de l'École des Chartes, LVIII, 523.

---

[1] Commynes-Dupont, III, 277; Commynes-Lenglet, III, 138; Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 149-150; M. de Maulde, *ut sup.*

CHAPTER IX

EDWARD'S TRIUMPH: THE BATTLES OF BARNET AND TEWKESBURY

WHEN the Duke of Burgundy permitted Somerset and Exeter to go back to England, he probably told himself they would join forces with Edward as soon as they discovered that it would be impossible to overthrow Warwick without overthrowing Henry also, and after they were gone he hastened his preparations to assist his brother-in-law. Like all beggars, Edward hoped for a good deal more than he got, but Charles ordered three or four ships to be equipped for him at Veere, and after Edward had mollified the Hanse towns by promising them "great privileges" when he recovered his kingdom, the duke was able to hire a number of Hanseatic ships on the understanding that they would not only escort the king to England, but would remain at his disposal, apparently to give him a chance to return to Burgundy should his kingdom decline to receive him, for fifteen days after he had effected a landing.[1] Nor did Edward fail to do what he could to help himself independently of Charles. Mention has already been made of the appeal which he made to Francis II and which resulted in the capture of the hackneys and the plate of the ambassadors Louis had sent to Henry and Warwick. After his letter to Francis had been dispatched, the king went to Bruges, where for a month he lived unostentatiously in Gruthuyse's beautiful house and evidently revelled in his host's famous library, as sooner or later he gave orders for several of the exquisite manuscripts which were produced at Bruges at that period and of which Gruthuyse owned many fine examples.[2] But he did not spend all that month turning over the pages of manuscripts; for Earl Rivers, who was with him, was making an effort to obtain more ships at Bruges,[1] and whether Rivers accomplished anything or not, at least two English ships were added to the fleet which was now assembling at Flushing. One John Lyster brought over to Zealand for Edward's use the ship of which he was master, and another English skipper, Stephen Dryver, who on several occasions had carried over to England messengers bearing letters from Edward to loyal friends at home, engaged to transport some of the thousand or more men, partly English, partly Flemish, whom the king expected to take with him.[2] Edward also succeeded in finding some money as well as ships for himself. Two merchants of the staple of Calais whose business brought them to Bruges while he was there loaned him two hundred and twenty marks, and three others a hundred pounds each;[3] and more than likely many other staplers gladly invested a little money in his cause, as not a wool merchant could possibly desire the war with Burgundy which it was evident his restoration alone could prevent.

---

[1] Chronicle of Christian von Geren (Bruns, Die Lübecker Bergenfahrer und ihre Chronistik, Berlin, 1900), 359; Commynes, I, 215-216; Hanserecesse, II, 6, pp. 404-405.

[2] Van Praet, Recherches sur Louis de Bruges, 10-11, 330. The letter printed in The Genealogist (see above) speaks of Edward as being then at Gruthuyse's house, and the date of the letter is given as 19th January. Yet Edward was certainly at St. Pol on 18th January, as he wrote his letter to

On 19th February Edward started for Flushing, and with that readiness to give pleasure which was one of his most endearing qualities, walked as far as Damme, instead of going by boat as he had planned, in order that the friendly people of Bruges might have the excitement of a procession.[4] After he reached Flushing some final matters required his attention, but on 2nd March he embarked in the *Antony* of Zealand, whose owner was Gruthuyse's

---

the Duke of Brittany from there on that date. And according to Waurin, on his way from St. Pol to Bruges he stopped at Lille, where the Duchess Margaret seems to have been residing at this time, as Gloucester spent a few days with her there in February. Waurin, III, 56; Commynes-Lenglet, II, 197.

[1] Letter in The Genealogist.

[2] Writs of Privy Seal, file 836, nos. 3321, 3323. Lyster's ship was the *Garse* and was probably identical with the *Garce* which assisted in the reduction of St. Michael's Mount in the winter of 1473-1474. Dryver, it appears, served Edward in the battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury with five men whom he brought at his own expense. According to the "Arrivall of Edward IV," whose author would not like to admit that the king brought foreign troops to England, Edward took two thousand Englishmen with him when he left Burgundy, but according to the chroniclers, his force was not quite so large and was composed in part of Flemings. Warwick wrote to Henry Vernon that the king had with him Flemings, Easterlings, and Danes "not exceeding the number of two thousand persons." Hist. MSS. Com., Report 12, app., 3-4; Oman, Warwick the Kingmaker, 221-222.

[3] Warrants for Issues, 12 Edw. IV, 2nd Dec., 14 Edw. IV, 13th and 16th July; Exchequer Accounts, Foreign Merchants, bundle 128, no. 40; Rymer, XI, 792.

[4] Van Praet, 10-11.

father-in-law, the rich and powerful Henri de Borselle, Seigneur de Veere. The *Antony* was a sturdy ship and well manned, and when the day came to distribute rewards, Edward requited her owner with important trading privileges for the town of Veere and an offer to make him an honorary member of his council and household,[1] while her master, Mark Symondson of Veere, received an annuity of twenty pounds, and her "lodesman," Robert Michelson of Hull, one of a hundred shillings from the customs and subsidies collected in his home port.[2] But a favourable wind was as indispensable as a stout ship, and for Edward, as for Margaret of Anjou, "the wind fell not good." It was not until 11th March, after nine days of tedious waiting, that the king was able to set sail, while by Charles's order the men of Ardres and Gravelines, led by a lieutenant of Jacques de Luxembourg, distracted the attention of Warwick's friends at Calais by a raid which resulted in a broken sluice in Oye and even threatened the safety of Newnham bridge.[3]

Knowing that he could count on the friendship of the Duke of Norfolk, Edward instructed Michelson to steer for the Norfolk coast, and on the morning of the 12th he arrived off Cromer. But unluckily Warwick had already summoned the Duke of Norfolk and all the other leading men of the county who were suspected of Yorkist preferences to London, where he was holding them in ward or under bond, and the Earl of Oxford had been sent to insure "the restful rule" of East Anglia. At the moment Edward appeared, Oxford was in Essex hurriedly raising men, but his brother, Thomas de Vere, was on guard, and when Edward sent Sir Robert Chamberlain and Sir Gilbert Debenham ashore to find out if it would be safe for him to land, they had to beat a hasty retreat to their boats.[1]

---

[1] Rymer, XI, 730-733. Yet the Seigneur de Veere was afterwards accused of not having done all that he ought to have done to prevent Warwick from returning to England from France and of having favoured the Easterlings, who were at war with the English. Reiffenberg, Hist. de l'Ordre de la Toison d'Or, 70.

[2] Writs of Privy Seal, file 834, no. 3218; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 266, 303. For other facts regarding Symondson, see Hanserecesse, II, 6, pp. 399, note 1, 486, 522. He and the *Antony* were in Edward's service again in 1472, and in the following year he was engaged in fitting up the *Grace Dieu* for the king. Tellers' Roll, Mich. 12 Edw. IV; Warrants for Issues, 13 Edw. IV, 27th April. See also a later chapter. Michelson, who afterwards became the master of the *James* of Hull, fell into the hands of the French at one time, and Edward gave him £60 towards the ransom of himself and his men. Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 368.

[3] Arrivall of Edw. IV, 2; Calais accounts, Foreign Rolls, 11 Edw. IV, m. E, and 12 Edw. IV, m. E and I.

On finding that Norfolk was in hostile hands, Edward started for the Yorkshire coast, but on the way he encountered a violent storm which scattered his fleet and sent one ship, full of horses, to the bottom. At last, however, on the 14th, he succeeded in reaching Ravenspur, that now vanished port at the mouth of the Humber which seventy-two years before had witnessed the landing of the grandfather of Henry VI when he came to overthrow Richard II. With Hastings and some five hundred of his men, he was soon on shore. About the same time the Duke of Gloucester landed on the coast several miles from Ravenspur, Earl Rivers farther up the Humber, at Paul, and the rest of the company wherever they could; and by the following morning the whole of the king's little army was gathered together again.

It must be admitted that Edward's kingdom manifested no enthusiasm when it learned that he had returned. Even the official narrator of the "arrival" has to acknowledge that "right few or almost none" of the people of the countryside came to welcome him. It even looked as if he were going to encounter serious resistance from a band of men which had assembled not far away at the summons of a Holderness man commonly called "Martin of the Sea" or "Martin atte See," though his real name seems to have been John Westerdale.[2] But if for a moment Edward feared that Warwick had the whole country under arms, he remembered how many good friends his father had had in Yorkshire, and this gave him courage to keep on his way. He also remembered how well a certain lie had served that other pretender to the throne who had once landed where he now stood, and profiting by Henry of Bolingbroke's example, he announced that he had come to claim, not the crown, but only the duchy which had been his father's.

---

[1] Arrivall, 1-2; Warkworth, 13; Paston Letters, V, 94-95; Warrants for Issues, 49 Hen. VI, 18th Feb. A few months later Edward ordered the arrest of one Thomas Dey who, during the time he was in Burgundy, had robbed Gilbert Debenham, squire, and his son, Sir Gilbert, "there then being with us, of great stuff and goods of theirs." Warrants under the Signet, file 1382, 13th Nov., 1471. Sir Gilbert Debenham was made chancellor of Ireland in 1474. Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 461.

[2] On 3rd February, 1472, Edward ordered "Martin atte See" to be arrested and brought before the council. Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 316. This seems to fit in with Warkworth's statement that Westerdale was afterwards "casten in prison in the Marshalsea." On 12th April, 1473, a pardon was granted to "Martinus del See" of Barmston, Holderness. Pardon Roll 12-17 Edw. IV, m. 27.

Nor was his lie less effective than Bolingbroke's; for after he had displayed some letters from the Earl of Northumberland, whose loyalty to him at this critical hour fully repaid him for the cost at which he had given back the earldom of Northumberland to the Percies, the people not only let him pass, but "took occasion to owe and bear him favour in that quarrel."

Edward's shortest road to London would have led him across the Humber, but he shrank from taking to his ships again, both because his men had already had quite enough of the water and because he was afraid that his enemies, on hearing of his action, would jump to the conclusion that he had been frightened away. So he turned his face towards York. Kingston-on-Hull refused to receive him, but Beverley was less unfriendly, and thanks in part to the proclamations he was now making in the name of Henry VI, as if he had come as a loyal duke to help his king, and in part to the money he judiciously distributed, the troops Warwick had called out to hold the country against him either melted away or kept out of his path. On the 18th the recorder of York, Thomas Conyers, came to tell him that it would be very unwise for him to try to enter York, but not being quite sure of the recorder's honesty, he went on, and a little later two other citizens of York, Robert Clifford and Richard Burgh, came to meet him and assured him that, if the duchy of York was all that he was seeking, the city would not say him nay. He was warned again by Conyers, however, and, as it turned out, when he reached York, Clifford and Burgh, while offering to allow him to enter the city, insisted that his army must stay outside. Always ready to do the daring thing, Edward accepted this proposal, and wearing the ostrich feather badge of the Prince of Wales and cheering for King Henry and his son, he entered York with only sixteen or seventeen men. Nor did it prove that he had not reckoned without his host, for, once inside of the walls, he had no trouble in ingratiating himself with the "worshipful folks," and in the evening his new friends opened the gates to his whole army.[1]

After spending the night in York, Edward proceeded to Tadcaster, from there, a day later, to Wakefield, and thence to Doncaster, the town from which he had fled in such haste six months before. The Marquis of Montagu was again at Pontefract, but he made no move—whether "with good will or no men may judge at their pleasure," says the officially inspired story, though the writer gives it as his own opinion that the marquis was afraid to offer battle, partly because many Yorkshire men loved Edward for his father's sake and partly because the Earl of Northumberland, without whose order much of the north would not stir, "sat still."[1] At Doncaster, if not before, Edward's army began to grow, as William Dudley, dean of the chapel, met him there with eight score men.[2] At Nottingham he welcomed even larger reinforcements, as there he was joined by six hundred men under the command of Sir William Parre and Sir James Harington. But in the meantime his enemies also were assembling their forces, and while he was at Nottingham, some of his scouts came back with the information that the Duke of Exeter, the Earl of Oxford, and Viscount Beaumont were at Newark with a "great fellowship."

---

[1] Arrivall, 3-5; Warkworth, 13-14; Hist. Croy. Cont., 554; Kingsford's London Chron., 183; Fabyan, 660. Cf. Milanese Papers, I, 153.

The news that three of his chief enemies were at Newark caused Edward to wheel about and start for that town, but hearing on the way that Exeter and his companions had taken fright and disappeared in the night, he hurried on to Leicester. There Sir William Stanley and Sir William Noreys brought him two or three thousand more men who had been gathered together in response to letters from Lord Hastings. Emboldened by this strengthening of his already considerable army, he marched directly into Warwickshire, where Warwick himself had been collecting men, by threats when gentler methods failed, to resist, according to his own words, "yonder man Edward, the king our sovereign lord's great enemy, rebel, and traitor."[3] Warwick, however, was not ready to fight, as Clarence, who had gone to the western counties to get more men, had written to him that he was coming to his aid and had entreated him not to risk a battle before his return. On hearing that Edward was drawing near, the earl retired into the strongly walled town of Coventry, and when the king arrived before the town two days later, 29th March,[1] he found his "great rebel," as he dubbed Warwick, beyond his reach. Discarding all make-believe, Edward then openly proclaimed himself king and challenged Warwick to come forth and settle scores with him with the sword, but though he waited three days, his challenge was not accepted. Warwick was evidently frightened, as he showed some desire to treat, but when he found that he could hope for little more than a promise of his life, he dropped the negotiations and remained sullenly in his stronghold.[2]

---

[1] Arrivall. Several years later one George Gower, sometime servant of the Marquis of Montagu, made complaint before the council of the duchy of Lancaster that, although at the beginning of Edward's reign he had been granted for life the keeping of the armoury in Pontefract Castle, William Armorer, another servant of the marquis, secured a grant of the same office from Henry VI, "in his latter reign," and then, after the battle of Barnet, one Robert Pylkyngton obtained it by "surmitting the said George to be against the king at the stowping thorn beside Doncaster and divers other places." Duchy of Lancaster, Minutes of the Duchy Council, 16-23 Edw. IV, p. 4 dorso. This sounds as if Montagu made some attempt to resist Edward.

[2] Warrants for Issues, 11 Edw. IV, 23rd Oct.

[3] Warwick's letter to Henry Vernon already cited.

No wonder Edward dared to show a bold front as he lay before Coventry; for he understood why Warwick refused to fight, and he knew that the help the earl was waiting for would never come. Clarence was bringing more troops, it was true, but he was bringing them, not to swell the forces of the man who had seduced him and then tossed him aside, but to help the brother he had been tempted into betraying.

Clarence was at Wells when, on 16th March, the first rumours of Edward's arrival in England reached his ears, and he immediately sent directions to his friend and confidant, Henry Vernon of Derbyshire, to array his tenants and to send "sure and trusty men" both to keep track of the king's movements and to find out what the Earls of Northumberland and Shrewsbury and Lord Stanley were doing. "We be ascertained," he wrote, "that it is said about London that King Edward is sailed by the coast of Norfolk toward Humber. Wherefore we pray you to send thither to inquire and understand of the truth and to certify us thereof, and, if he be in those coasts, that alway ye have spies there to certify us from time to time of the tidings and guiding, one coming to us and another alway abiding." But though the duke had decided on the course he meant to take, he did not want to commit himself too soon. After dispatching this letter to Vernon, he remained at Welles waiting for further news, and on the 23rd he wrote again to his friend asking him to come to him at once with all the men and money he could scrape together to help him to resist the king's enemies, "which be landed, as we understand certainly." Vernon, in fact, was much in demand, as Warwick too was seeking his aid, begging him to come to Coventry " with as many people defensibly arrayed as ye can readily make " and adding appealingly with his own hand, " Henry, I pray you fail not now as ever I may do for you." But Clarence's hold on Vernon seems to have been stronger than Warwick's, for on the 30th, by which time he was on his way to meet Edward, the duke wrote to Vernon again, not only to tell him to " haste you towards us as soon as ye may," but to thank him for " the good devoir that ye have done in sending forth men to understand of the rule and guiding of Edward, late king " and for a report concerning " the good and loving disposition towards us of our cousin of Shrewsbury."[1]

---

[1] See a document printed in Commynes-Dupont, III, 282-283, which is really an abridgment of the "Arrivall." A translation of this document may be found in Archæologia, XXI, 15.

[2] Arrivall, 7-9; Warkworth and Fabyan, *ut sup.;* Kingsford's London Chron., 184. Cf. Gerhard von Wesel's letter, Hanserecesse, II, 6, p. 416.

On 2nd April, from Burford, Clarence wrote a fourth letter to Vernon in which he bade him bring to him the men he had gathered together and to keep " the way towards us to Banbury ward " ;[2] and it seems to have been on the following day that the meeting between Edward and Clarence took place. Edward had sent some troops in pursuit of Exeter, Oxford, and Beaumont which on this very day put King Henry's three friends to flight at Leicester,[3] but he had his main army with him, and when he was told that Clarence was approaching from Banbury, he went out three miles along the road with all his soldiers to meet him. When the duke was but half a mile away, the king halted his army and went forward attended only by Gloucester, Rivers, Hastings, and a few other friends, while Clarence, also accompanied by a few friends, came half way to meet him. Clarence instantly threw himself on his knees, but Edward as quickly raised him up and kissed him many times,[4] and after that there was " right kind and loving language betwixt them two." Gloucester also spoke with the repentant brother ; the other noblemen fraternized and exchanged greetings, and then, as " the trumpets and minstrels blew up," Clarence addressed Edward's men " in his best manner," and Edward saluted Clarence's men and promised them his " grace and good love " in generous measure. Finally, all went together to Warwick " and there lodged and in the country near adjoining."[5]

---

[1] Hist. MSS. Com., Report 12, app. 4, pp. 3-4.

[2] *Ibid.*, MSS. of the Duke of Portland, IV, 188.

[3] Commynes-Dupont, III, 283 ; Gerhard von Wesel's letter, Hanserecesse, *ut sup.* ; Waurin, III, 288.

[4] See a letter written by the Duchess of Burgundy to her mother-in-law, Waurin, III, 210-215.

[5] Arrivall, 11. Cf. Warkworth, 15, and Political Poems and Songs, II, 273.

After Edward had gone to meet Clarence, Montagu, Exeter, Oxford, and Beaumont all seem to have succeeded in joining Warwick in Coventry. But the defection of Clarence and his men more than offset these gains, and when Edward returned to Coventry with Clarence and again asked Warwick to come out and fight, the earl refused as before. Clarence then tried his hand at peacemaking, and this time Edward offered Warwick a pardon "with divers good conditions"; but the earl would listen to no proposals of surrender, and as food both for man and for beast was beginning to give out, Edward decided to let him stay in Coventry and go on to London.

On Friday, 5th April, Edward left Coventry, and on the following Sunday, which he spent at Daventry, occurred one of those trivial "miracles" that in those superstitious days often exerted not a little influence on events. The king, as was proper, attended mass in the parish church, and according to the story, St. Anne, who, as it was Lent, was shut up in her little wooden shrine, threw open her doors to remind him that in the days of his great adversity he had prayed to her for help and had promised that the next time he saw an image of her he would "thereto make his prayers and give his offering." Of course the king remembered his vow as soon as he beheld the saint, and having fulfilled it, he went on his way rejoicing, as the miracle of St. Anne, like the miracle of the three suns at the time of the battle of Mortimer's Cross, was hailed by the people as a "good prognostic of good adventure."[1]

A few days after leaving Daventry Edward was at Dunstable, and from there he sent comforting messages to Queen Elizabeth in the Westminster sanctuary and also a letter to London's magistrates, who on that very day were reading an earlier letter from him commanding them to seize King Henry and keep him in safe custody. But Warwick was also sending messages to London exhorting the Archbishop of York and the mayor and aldermen to hold the city for Henry until he came, and his letter was read to the common council on the same day, 10th April, on which Edward's letter from Dunstable was read.[2]

The poor common council was almost at its wits' end, as not only was Edward known to be approaching, but news that Queen

[1] Arrivall, 11-14; Gerhard von Wesel's letter; Political Poems and Songs, II, 273-274.

[2] London Journals, 7, f. 232b, and 8, f. 4; Arrivall, 15; Waurin, III, 120.

Margaret and her son had arrived in England was expected any hour. Already, two days before, the Duke of Somerset and the Earl of Devonshire had gone to meet Margaret, and they had taken with them a commission for the Prince to raise an army to resist Edward.[1] Moreover, Mayor Stokton was still in bed, and by this time Sir Thomas Cook too had lost his courage. Cook and his son Philip fled across the sea—only to be captured on their way to France by a Flemish ship—and it was Ralph Verney who was now trying to fill Stokton's place. But even Verney did not covet martyrdom for King Henry's sake, and after Edward's and Warwick's letters had been read and the wardens of the guilds and the constables of the wards had been called in to give advice, it was resolved that, as Edward, late king of England, was hastening towards the city with a powerful army, and as the inhabitants were not sufficiently versed in the use of arms to withstand so large a force, no attempt should be made to oppose him.[2] At the very moment this brave decision was reached Henry was being led in procession through the city by the Archbishop of York and Lord Sudeley, the only lords of Warwick's party in London, and with as large an armed escort as it had been possible to gather together; but the sight of the feeble king sitting limply on his horse and followed by a handful of soldiers "rather withdrew men's hearts than otherwise," and when it was learned in the evening that Edward and his army had arrived at St. Albans, even the Archbishop of York gave up the struggle and sent secretly to the "usurper" to ask for grace.[3]

During the night Edward spent at St. Albans his friends in the Tower easily succeeded in overpowering the keepers, and though the next morning many ragged-staff badges were still to be seen in the streets of the city, it was evident that Warwick's day was done and that London was ready for Edward's return. There were three reasons, Philip de Commynes was told, why London was inclined to welcome Edward at this time. These were: first, the presence of so many of his friends in the sanctuaries and the birth of his son; second, the large debts he owed to the merchants of the city, who saw no hope of getting their money back until he wore the crown again; third, the influence exerted on husbands and kinsmen by the women of the city, both ladies of high degree and "riches bourgeoises," with some of whom the handsome and engaging king had been on terms of perhaps too great intimacy.[1] But evidently Commynes' informant ought to have added a fourth reason to his list, to wit, fear; for probably few considered Warwick a match for Edward on a battlefield and, into the bargain, Edward was close at hand, while Warwick was still miles away. At all events, the magistrates and other leading citizens sent word to Edward that they would be "guided to his pleasure," and during the dinner hour, while the guards were off duty, the aldermen and Thomas Urswick, the recorder, opened the gates to the king, who entered the city supported by Clarence, Gloucester, Rivers, Hastings, and many other lords, and received a hearty welcome from his friends, including his former chancellor and his former keeper of the privy seal, the Bishops of Bath and Rochester.[2]

---

[1] Arrivall, 14-15; Gerhard von Wesel's letter; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 252; Rymer, XI, 706. Hall states that Somerset had command of Warwick's main "battle" in the battle of Barnet, whereas the duke was not even present on that occasion.

[2] London Journal 8, *ut sup*.

[3] Arrivall, 15-16; Fabyan and Warkworth, *ut sup;* Gerhard von Wesel's letter.

The first thing Edward did after entering the city was to ride to St. Paul's to make a thank-offering at the rood of the north door. Then he went to find King Henry in the episcopal palace where Warwick had left him. It was the Archbishop of York who brought Henry forth, and to the rival, frail in body and in mind, whose crown he was about to take from him for the second time, Edward extended his hand with cold civility; but Henry, not content with such a greeting, half trustingly, half fearfully offered an embrace with the words: "My cousin of York, you are very welcome. I know that in your hands my life will not be in danger." Surprised and perhaps touched, Edward assured Henry that he had nothing to fear and then turned away to listen to the excuses the archbishop was waiting to pour into his ear. George Neville was glib of tongue and, being an archbishop, could not well be hanged, whatever his deserts, but for the time being Edward sent him to the Tower, along with King Henry himself, Lord Sudeley, and the Bishops of Winchester, Lincoln, Chichester, Llandaff, and St. David's.[3]

---

[1] Commynes, I, 216-217.

[2] Gerhard von Wesel's letter; the Duchess of Burgundy's letter, Waurin, *ut sup.;* Arrivall, 17; Warkworth.

[3] Arrivall, *ut sup.;* Gerhard von Wesel's and the Duchess of Burgundy's letters; Paston Letters, V, 99; Fabyan, *ut sup.;* Stow, 423; Le Roux de Lincy, Chants Hist. et Populaires, 175. No one says that the Bishop of

From the episcopal palace Edward proceeded to Westminster, and after stopping in the Abbey just long enough to say a few prayers to God, to St. Peter, and to St. Edward and to give the Archbishop of Canterbury a chance to set the crown on his head for a moment, he hurried to the sanctuary to greet his wife and daughters and, above all, the little son and heir born to him in his absence.

> " The kyng comfortid the quene and other ladyes eke;
> His swete babis full tendurly he did kys;
> The yonge prynce he behelde and in his armys did bere.
> Thus his bale turnyd hym to blis;
> Aftur sorow joy, the course of the worlde is.
> The sighte of his babis relesid parte of his woo;
> Thus the wille of God in every thyng is doo."[1]

As life was more secure inside of the walls of London than at Westminster, Edward soon returned to the city, taking the queen and his children with him; and that night they all spent with the Duchess of York at Baynard's Castle. On the morrow, which was Good Friday, Lord Howard and Lord Hastings's brother, who had both been in sanctuary at Colchester, arrived in the city, and so did Sir Humphrey Bouchier and his brother, Lord Berners's sons. The Bourchiers brought with them a considerable number of Kentishmen, and most timely did this addition to Edward's army prove to be, as it was learned before the day was over that Warwick was now advancing rapidly on London. Perhaps the earl did not know that the city had already submitted to Edward; perhaps he did know but hoped, as the Yorkist narrative suggests, that he might be able to surprise the king while his attention was taken up with the religious exercises of Easter Sunday; or perhaps he was desperate and determined to strike at all hazards. For word had come that on 4th April the king of France, who had ruined all by his insistence on the war against Burgundy, had signed a truce with Charles; and even as he marched on London, Warwick was inditing a bitter letter to Louis accusing him of treachery and perjury.[2]

Llandaff was among those sent to the Tower by Edward, but for proof that he was a prisoner there on 27th July, see a petition of that date from the archdeacon and chapter of Llandaff. Signed Bills, file 1502, no. 4396. Cf. Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 287. Payments for the expenses of King Henry and his guard at the Tower are entered on Issue Roll, Easter 11 Edw. IV, 12th June. See Rymer, XI, 712, and Devon, Issues of the Exchequer, 497.

[1] Political Poems and Songs, II, 274.

[2] Arrivall, 17-18; Gerhard von Wesel's and the Duchess of Burgundy's letters; Hist. Croy. Cont., 554-555; Waurin, III, 288; Basin, II, 274.

In twenty-four hours' time Edward was ready for his final reckoning with Warwick. On Saturday, at mid-day, he mustered his men in St. John's field, and at four o'clock he marched out of the city.[1] He carried King Henry along with him so that he would be safely out of the way should Queen Margaret arrive, but he left the Archbishop of York in the Tower to enjoy the companionship not only of the other prisoners there, but of Queen Elizabeth and her children, the Duchess of York, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishop of Bath, since all these, while hoping for the best, preferred to place thick walls and strong between themselves and the outside world until the issue of the battle was known. The road Edward took was the one leading to Barnet, and as by this time Warwick was so near that that night he camped on Gladmore Heath, a mile and a half north-west of Barnet, the king had gone but a few miles when at Hornsey (Haringay) Park, in the dusk of the evening, he met some "afore-riders" whom Warwick had sent forward to find out how matters stood in London. These men were immediately chased back to Barnet, and an advance guard which the earl had stationed in the town was also put to flight; but nothing more could be done at the moment, as it was now quite dark, and Edward in his turn sought a camping place for the night. The spot the king chose left the St. Albans highway between his camp and Warwick's, but daylight was to reveal that he was much nearer the earl than he supposed and also that, when he drew up his men in battle array, his line was "somewhat asiden-hand" of Warwick's, instead of "even in front" of it as he would have desired.[2]

Warwick had placed his artillery in such a manner as to cover the highway,[3] and he kept his guns busy all through the night, but his gunners, aiming in the darkness, overshot the king's camp and not a man was hurt. A heavy fog settled down as the night wore on, but with the first light of dawn Edward was ready for battle. It was Easter morning and, committing his cause to God, between four and five o'clock the king rushed upon his foes out of the dense mist. Warwick had the larger supply of artillery, but this gave him no advantage, as the battle became at once a hand-to-hand struggle in which guns were useless and mercy was neither asked nor given. It was at the east end that Edward's line overreached Warwick's, and there the earl's men were soon overpowered and driven back with heavy losses; but at the west end, where the situation was reversed and Warwick's line overreached Edward's, the Earl of Oxford routed the Yorkists so thoroughly that many of them fled to Barnet, and even to London, spreading the news that Warwick had won the battle, that King Edward was a prisoner, and that the Dukes of Clarence and Gloucester were dead.

---

[1] Gerhard von Wesel's letter.

[2] For plans of the battlefield of Barnet, see Ramsay, II, 370, and Gentleman's Magazine, Sept., 1844. As the "Arrivall" speaks of "the west end" and "the east end" of the king's line, the two armies cannot have been drawn up on lines running as directly north and south as in Ramsay's plan.

[3] Gerhard von Wesel's letter.

The most desperate fighting of the day, however, took place in the centre of the field, where Edward and Warwick were face to face. There, the Yorkist account of the battle declares, the king "beat and bore down afore him all that stood in his way, and then turned to the range first on that one hand and then on that other hand in length, and so beat and bore down so that nothing might stand in the sight of him and the well assured fellowship that attended truly upon him." Philip de Commynes also testifies to Edward's prowess, for he says that the king "combatit en sa personne autant ou plus que nul homme qui fust des deux coustez."[1] Yet Warwick, who was persuaded by Montagu, Commynes says, to fight on foot that day, though it was contrary to his custom, stood his ground so well that more than once he flattered himself that the victory was his, and when, at the end of three or four hours of slaughter,[2] Edward finally triumphed, he owed his success chiefly to a blunder on the part of some of his enemies. What Oxford had accomplished the fog hid both from Edward and from Warwick, and as his men fell to plundering as they came back from their pursuit of the Yorkists along the London road, it was some time before Oxford could collect them and return to the field. In the meantime, unknown to him, the positions of the opposing armies had been exactly reversed. Consequently when he advanced with the intention of attacking Edward from behind, he came up at the rear of Warwick's army instead of Edward's; and as his badge, "a star with streams," resembled Edward's, "the sun with streams," so closely that it was difficult to distinguish between them in the fog, Warwick's men mistook friends for foes and opened fire on them. Terrified, Oxford's men fled with a shout of "treason! treason!" and the earl himself, who for his part never stopped until he was safe in Scotland,[1] his two brothers, and Viscount Beaumont also ran away.

---

[1] Commynes, I, 218.

[2] According to the "Arrivall," the battle lasted three hours, according to Gerhard von Wesel, it began at four o'clock in the morning and ended at eight.

The loss of Oxford and his troops was a serious blow to Warwick, but worse was still to come; for some of his men discovered Edward's badge on Montagu's breast and, without further ado, slew the marquis on the spot. When he heard of this last disaster, Warwick's courage completely gave way. Leaping upon a horse, he escaped into a wood, but in a little while he fell into the hands of some of Edward's men. Edward, as soon as he was informed that Warwick had been taken, hurried to the scene in the hope of saving the earl's life—because some gratitude for great services rendered in other days still lingered in his breast or because a live Warwick would grace his triumph better than a dead one, who can say? But he was too late. Warwick's captors had already "killed him and despoiled him naked."[2]

"And so King Edward got that field." Some thought he had won it because of the incantations of one Friar Bungay, but loyal Yorkists believed that God, the Virgin, St. George and all the other Saints of Heaven, looking upon the king's cause as "true and rightwise," gave him the victory. A fiercer battle than that of Barnet, men said, England had not known in a hundred years. When the fight ended, the bodies of some fifteen hundred Englishmen and more than ten thousand arrows, it was estimated, lay scattered over the field. But, unlike most of Edward's earlier battles, this one brought death chiefly to the rank and file, as the king, Commynes says, angered by the favour his subjects had shown to Warwick, had resolved before he returned to England that he would no longer give orders to spare the common people, as he had been wont to do on going into battle.[3] However, the nobility did not escape all loss, as not only were Warwick and Montagu among the slain, but on Edward's side Lord Say, Lord Cromwell, and Sir Humphrey Bourchier fell on the field and Lord Mountjoy's son and heir died of his wounds. Gloucester and Rivers too were wounded, though slightly, and the Duke of Exeter, who, in spite of his hostility to Warwick, had fought bravely on the earl's side that day, was "left naked for dead in the field" and owed his life to the devotion of one of his men, who carried him to a house, brought him a "leech," and then helped him to reach the Westminster sanctuary.[1]

---

[1] On 28th April the king of Scotland granted a safeconduct for Oxford and forty other Englishmen. Register of the Great Seal of Scotland, II, 210.

[2] Arrivall, 18-20; Gerhard von Wesel's and the Duchess of Burgundy's letters; Warkworth, 16; Fabyan, 661.

[3] At the time of the battle of Northampton, one chronicle states, Edward and Warwick gave orders that no one should lay hands on the king or on the common people, "but only on the lords, knights, and squires." Davies' Eng. Chron., 97.

When the battle was over, Edward refreshed his troops in Barnet, and then, after ordering that the bodies of Warwick and Montagu be sent after him, went back to London, where the aldermen received him outside the gate and where again he rode straight to St. Paul's to make his offering—this time two banners riddled by many an arrow—at the rood of the north door. A little later another procession, sadly different in character, passed through the city streets. During the battle King Henry had made an attempt to steal away, but had been captured, when he was half way to St. Albans, and carried back, and some hours after Edward's triumphal entry into the city he was "brought riding in a long gown of blue velvet" through Cheapside to Westminster and then back to the Tower. And if anyone still questioned the finality of Edward's victory, their doubt must have been removed when, on the following morning, about seven o'clock, a cart containing two coffins came trundling along the road from Barnet and wended its way to St. Paul's. For in those coffins lay the bodies of Warwick and Montagu, naked save for the loin cloths. To forestall "feigned seditious tales" that the great Earl of Warwick was "yet on life," for two days the coffins were left open on the church floor that the gaping and the incredulous might gaze on the dead face of the man who had made and unmade kings; but finally the two brothers were carried to Bisham Abbey to be interred in the family tomb of the Montagues, now long since vanished with the bones it held.[1] Two days later the third brother, the Archbishop of York, received his pardon, though not his freedom, as he was still kept under guard at the Tower.[2]

---

[1] Warkworth, 16-17; Arrivall, 20; Gerhard von Wesel's letter; Paston Letters, V, 100; Hist. Croy. Cont., 555; Fabyan, *ut sup.* Most of those who fell at Barnet were buried on the field, and a chapel was afterwards erected to their memory. But by Stow's day the chapel had been converted into a dwelling, and since that time it seems to have disappeared altogether, as a small eighteenth century obelisk, set up at the junction of the roads from Hatfield and St. Albans, is the only thing which now marks the site of the battle in which Warwick the Kingmaker lost his life. The bodies of two Gascons who fell on Edward's side and whose names are given as the Lord de la Force and Isaru de la Berina, Lord de Gensac, were taken to London and buried in the church of St. Martin in the Vintry. On 30th June the king granted a year's safeconduct for a ship of France or Brittany to one John Dort, Gascon, to sustain two priests who were to sing for the souls of these two men for two years. Writs of Privy Seal, file 833, no. 3180. "Monseigneur de la Forsse," who is certainly not to be identified with Bernard de la Forsse, is mentioned in one list of those who fell at Barnet. Le Roux de Lincy, *ut sup.*

It was a decisive and overwhelming victory that Edward had won at Barnet, and he had fought his last battle with Warwick. But weary as he and his victorious army were, there was another enemy to be reckoned with, and at once, as on Tuesday came word that Margaret of Anjou and her son had arrived in England.

The French ambassadors who had departed for home in such unseemly haste when they heard that Edward was on his way to England took word to Louis that Warwick had about eight thousand men ready to cross the sea to fight Burgundy. They also stated, however, that these men would be sent only when Queen Margaret returned to England,[3] and thereupon Louis seems to have resolved that, whatever the dangers, Margaret must sail at once. The Prior of St. John's was still waiting for the queen at Honfleur, and on 24th March she embarked in one of his ships, with her son and his wife, while the Countess of Warwick, who for some reason chose to land at Portsmouth instead of at Weymouth, the place for which Margaret was bound, embarked in another. But again and again storms drove the ships back to port, and thus by the irony of fate it happened that the mother who had so passionately refused to allow her son to go to England as long as there was any danger brought him thither herself in the evening of the very day on which the cause of the house of Lancaster was ruined for ever by Warwick's death.[4]

As the Countess of Warwick "had a ship of advantage," she was the first to reach England, and from Portsmouth she went to Southampton with the intention of going to meet Margaret as the queen came from Weymouth. But at Southampton she heard of the catastrophe at Barnet and of her husband's death, and at once she fled to Beaulieu Abbey and took sanctuary. As for Margaret, she did not hear of the battle of Barnet until Monday, when Somerset and Devonshire met her at Cerne Abbey; and while the news made her "right heavy and sorry," she tried to be comforted when Somerset and Devonshire declared that, though one battle had been lost, "their party was never the feebler but rather stronger" by reason of what had happened and that they would soon assemble a larger army, which Edward could never withstand.[1] Orders were immediately sent into Somersetshire, Dorsetshire, and a part of Wiltshire, where the ground had already been prepared, "to arready and array the people," and then Margaret and all her party, which included, in addition to the Prince of Wales and his wife, the Prior of St. John's and Lord Wenlock, accompanied Somerset and Devonshire to Exeter. There in a short time the "whole might" of Devon and Cornwall rallied round them, and as the call made upon Somersetshire, Dorsetshire, and Wiltshire also brought good response, with an ever increasing army the queen proceeded from Exeter to Taunton and from Taunton to Wells, where, too much in the manner of her northerners of other days, her soldiers plundered the episcopal palace and broke open the jail.[2]

---

[1] Gerhard von Wesel's and the Duchess of Burgundy's letters; Arrivall, 21; Fabyan and Kingsford's London Chron., *ut sup.*; Warkworth, 17; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 184; Dugdale, I, 306; Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 153.

[2] Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 258; Rymer, XI, 709.

[3] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 150.

[4] Arrivall, 22; Gerhard von Wesel's letter; Warkworth, *ut sup.* There is still in existence a letter which the Prince of Wales wrote at Weymouth on 13th April summoning one John Daunt to his aid. See an article on the battle of Tewkesbury by Canon Bazeley, Trans. of British and Gloucestershire Archæological Society, 1903, with which is printed an excellent map of the battlefield.

Edward reasoned, when he was told that Margaret had landed at Weymouth, that if she felt strong enough to advance on London at once, she would take the road through Salisbury. If, on the contrary, she needed to add to her forces before approaching London, he thought she would either follow the coast through Hampshire and Sussex into Kent, to make her onset from there with the help of Warwick's Kentish friends, or else set out for Wales to find Jasper Tudor and then pass into Cheshire and Lancashire, where, as in Wales, the friends of the house of Lancaster had always been numerous. So he sent out spies in all directions and then hurriedly got his army into marching order again, arranging for the care of those who had been wounded at Barnet, sending hither and yon for fresh troops to meet him at Windsor, providing himself with "artillery and ordnance, guns and other, for the field great plenty," and soliciting money from London, where the news that Margaret of Anjou was in England again excited plenty of apprehension. "The world I assure you is right queasy," wrote Sir John Paston to his mother a few days after the battle of Barnet, "as ye shall know within this month; the people here feareth it sore. God hath showed Himself marvellously like Him that made all and can undo again when Him list; and I can think that by all likelihood shall show Himself as marvellous again, and that in short time." But fortunately the common council was more ready than Paston to believe that God had rendered a final decision against the house of Lancaster, and two days after it was known that Margaret had arrived, Edward was granted a thousand marks by the city for the defence of the realm.[1]

---

[1] Somerset had just come from Salisbury, where he secured a promise of forty men. In the end, however, these men were sent to Edward's aid instead of to Margaret's. Hatcher, Old and New Sarum, 177-178.

[2] Arrivall, 23, 25; Signed Bills, file 1503, 25th Feb., 11 Edw. IV—a petition from Thomas Overay, canon of Wells, asking for a pardon for the Bishop of Bath and Wells for escape of felons, etc., and stating that Margaret and her son and the Duke of Somerset, "with other adherents in great multitude and might arrayed in manner of war, riotously, with force and arms, entered and spoiled the palace of Wells and, among other great and detestable offences, there brake up the gaol and prison" of the bishop. Cf. Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 310; Rymer, XI, 736.

On 19th April Edward went to Windsor to keep the feast of St. George and to meet his troops, and a few days later his spies brought the information that, although Margaret had sent a few men as far as Salisbury to give the impression that she was moving in that direction, in reality she was on her way to Wales. On Wednesday, the 24th, therefore, the king marched away towards the west, while a proclamation sent throughout the country threatened death and forfeiture to anyone giving succour to "Margaret, calling her queen, which is a Frenchwoman born and daughter to him that is extreme adversary and mortal enemy to all this our land and people of the same," or to her son, as they had entered England with many Frenchmen, traitors, and rebels and were levying war against the king whose title to the throne had been solemnly approved not only by parliament, but by God "in divers battles."[2] By this time Margaret had sent another band of men towards Reading to make it appear that she was coming through Berkshire and Oxfordshire, and perhaps for a moment Edward was deceived, as Sunday found him no farther on his way than Abingdon. But on Monday he was at Cirencester, and although the first reports he received there led him to prepare at once for battle, later news caused him to hurry on to Malmesbury, where he was told that Margaret had turned aside to Bristol.

[1] Arrivall, 24; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 259, 283-285; Paston Letters, V, 100; London Journal 7, f. 233.

[2] Arrivall, 24-25; Rymer, XI, 709.

Bristol made Margaret welcome and gave her some men, including its recorder,[1] and also money and artillery; but by Thursday she was again on the march. She planned to spend that night on Sodbury Hill and then slip into Wales before Edward, who, she now knew, was on her trail, could discover her whereabouts. But Edward was nearer than she thought, and when, in the evening, her harbingers came back from Sodbury village and told her that they had had an encounter with Edward's harbingers there, she took fright and pushed on under cover of darkness towards Gloucester. Edward himself spent the night on Sodbury Hill and hoped for an early morning battle as at Barnet, but when he arose at three o'clock to prepare for the attack, no enemy was to be found.

Realizing that Margaret must have gone towards Gloucester, Edward sent messengers to tell Lord Beauchamp's son, who had charge of the town and castle of Gloucester, not to permit her to enter the place; and though some of the townspeople would have been glad to receive the queen, when she arrived about ten o'clock on Friday morning, Beauchamp succeeded in keeping the gates barred. The queen's men made "great menaces," but as Edward was close at their heels, there was no time to pause for an argument, much less for a siege; and though her troops were very tired from their all-night march and the day was hot, Margaret hastened on to Tewkesbury, which she reached about four o'clock in the afternoon and where, since neither man nor beast could go farther, she turned at bay. The queen pitched her camp just beyond the town and the Abbey in some fields known as "the Gastons," whose "foul lanes and deep ditches and many hedges, with hills and valleys," made them "a right evil place to approach," and there she awaited Edward's coming. She did not have to wait long, for though Edward too had a hard march, by night he was but three miles away, and the next morning, 4th May, so early that Margaret, the Prince's wife, the Countess of Devonshire, and Lady Katharine Vaux[2] barely had time to take shelter in a neighbouring religious house, the trumpets blew up and the battle began.

---

[1] "Master Hervey," recorder of Bristol, was killed in the battle of Tewkesbury. See an extract from a Tewkesbury chronicle printed in Kingsford's Eng. Hist. Lit. in Fif. Cent., 376-378.

[2] Lady Katharine Vaux was probably specially dear to Margaret because she was a native of Provence. Cal. Patent Rolls, 1452-1461, p. 342. Her husband, Sir William Vaux, who had been attainted in 1461 but had been

To the Duke of Gloucester, who commanded Edward's van, fell the honour of opening the battle of Tewkesbury, but to the "right-a-sharp shower" of arrows which the duke sent into the enemy's midst Somerset, who led Margaret's van, gave prompt reply, and the ditches, hedges, and bushes made any rapid advance impossible. Suddenly, however, as Gloucester's men were struggling forward as best they could, Somerset and Sir Hugh Courtenay, either because they found themselves in danger or because they thought they saw a chance to strike a telling blow, "broke the field," rushed forward a little beyond Gloucester's men, and then down from a hill upon the end of the king's line. The assault was so sudden and from such an unexpected direction that Edward was taken by surprise, and the result might have been disastrous had it not been for the timely assistance given by two hundred spears who had been sent, before the battle began, to a wooded park near by with orders to "employ themself in the best wise they could." As the king and Gloucester turned sharply and drove Somerset and Courtenay back up the hill, these spears came hurrying to their aid, and Somerset's and Courtenay's men were so taken by surprise in their turn that they fled in all directions, but only to be captured or mowed down by the sword in the lanes and ditches, in the wooded park, or in what is known to-day as "the bloody meadow." And while this butchery was going on, Edward delivered another attack in another part of the field "where was chief Edward, called Prince," and delivered it with such success that in a short time the Prince's men were fleeing as wildly as Somerset's and Courtenay's and being cut down in the same ruthless way. Though some panic-stricken fugitives succeeded in reaching the Abbey, others who escaped the sword were drowned in the Avon near a mill standing close to the town, and the Prince himself, while trying to reach the town, was overtaken and put to death, though he "cried for succour," it is said, to the Duke of Clarence.[1]

According to a story which Fabyan relates and which Hall has embellished with many picturesque details, the son of Henry VI and Margaret of Anjou was not killed in the heat of battle, but was captured and taken before Edward, who, enraged by the proud answers the Prince made to his questions, struck the youth across

included in the amnesty granted to so many Lancastrians in September, 1470, was killed in the battle of Tewkesbury. Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 214.

[1] Arrivall, 26-30; Warkworth, 18.

the face with his gauntlet and then suffered Clarence and Gloucester, Lord Hastings, and Sir Thomas Grey to do him to death.[1] And for the benefit of the credulous tourist who visits Tewkesbury at the present time blood-stains are pointed out on the floor of a house in Church Street as proof that the Prince of Wales died there at the hands of Edward's brothers and friends. But though the chronicler of Croyland Abbey also seems to imply that the Prince did not die on the field, Clarence wrote to Henry Vernon two days after the battle of Tewkesbury that "Edward, late called Prince," with the Earl of Devonshire and "other estates, knights, squires, and gentlemen, were slain in plain battle."[2]

Other noblemen who fell on the day the Prince of Wales perished were John Beaufort, Somerset's brother, Lord Wenlock, and those two staunch friends of Queen Margaret, Sir Edmund Hampden and Sir Robert Whitingham. According to Hall, Wenlock was cut down by the hand of Somerset himself, who, seeing Warwick's friend "standing still," reviled him as a traitor and with his axe "struck the brains out of his head." But even when the battle was over, there was more bloodshed to come; for as soon as the field was won and knighthood had been bestowed on forty-three heroes of the day, Edward proceeded to the Abbey. The official account says the king was received "with procession and so conveyed through the church and the choir to the high altar, with great devotion praising God and yielding unto Him convenient laud," and that, although it would have been "lawful" for him to have ordered them to be taken out and executed as traitors, as the Abbey had never been granted a franchise "for any offenders against their prince having recourse thither," he gave his "free pardon" to all the fugitives he found in the church. But the story told by a less biassed authority is that the king entered the Abbey sword in hand and that it was only the admonitions and pleadings of a priest, who "turned out at his mass" with the Holy Sacrament in his hand, that saved Somerset, the Prior of St. John's, Sir Humphrey Audley, Sir Thomas Tresham, Sir Gervase Clifton, and a dozen other men from instant death.[3] And certainly if the king pardoned, as his own historian would have us believe, his pardon proved worthless in the case of the chief offenders; for on Monday Somerset, the Prior of St. John's, Audley, Tresham, Clifton, Sir Hugh Courtenay, and about ten other men who had been found in the Abbey or the town were tried before the Duke of Gloucester, constable of England, and the Duke of Norfolk, marshal of England, sentenced to death, and immediately beheaded. All that Edward's apologist can find to say in extenuation of this proceeding is that the king's victims had been provokers of "the great rebellion that so long had endured" and that after their execution he gave them, as well as his other enemies who had died on the battlefield, decent burial "without any quartering or defouling their bodies by setting up at any open place." The body of the Prior of St. John's, "closed in lead," was sent to London to be interred in the church of his Order, but the son of Henry VI was buried under the choir of Tewkesbury Abbey, and Somerset and his brother, the Earl of Devonshire, Audley, Whitingham, Tresham, and many others who had fought and lost on that fatal day in other parts of the church or in the churchyard.[1]

---

[1] Fabyan, 662; Hall, 301. Cf. Waurin, III, 290, and Chronique Scandaleuse, II, 277.

[2] Hist. MSS. Com., Report 12, app. 4, p. 4.

[3] Warkworth. Compare the statement in the extract from a Tewkesbury chronicle printed by Mr. Kingsford that the king and his men entered the Abbey "violente manu" and that the church was considered to be so polluted by what had occurred in it that no divine services were held in it for a month.

Edward had failed in but one thing: he had not found Margaret of Anjou. He knew that she must be near, but he had no time to wait while a search was made for her, as events in other parts of England called him away. London in particular was in serious trouble again, as Warwick's friends in Kent and Essex, refusing to believe that he was really dead, were surging about her gates once more and had found an able and determined leader in the Bastard of Fauconberg. At the moment the battle of Barnet occurred the Bastard was cruising about near the coast with his fleet, but when it became known at Calais that a battle had been fought between Edward and Warwick, Sir Walter Wrottesley and Sir Geoffrey Gate, who had been left in charge at Calais when Wenlock went to join Queen Margaret, sent him three hundred men with directions to go to Kent and stir up the people. And so willing did the Bastard find the people of Kent to be stirred up that even Rivers, Duras, and Sir John Scott, whom the king's council in London sent to the scene, were unable to hold them in check.[2]

[1] Arrivall, 30-31; Warkworth, 18-19; Kingsford's Tewkesbury chron.; Paston Letters, V, 104-105; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 184; Ricart's Kalendar, 45.

[2] Warkworth, 19; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 285; Issue Roll, Easter 11 Edw. IV, 15th and 19th May.

But while the reports which Edward had been receiving from London were very serious, those which came from the north were, if possible, still worse; for there King Henry's sympathizers were said to be rising in alarming numbers, making "murmurs and commotions," as Edward expressed it in a letter to Henry Vernon, "intending the destruction of the Church, of us, our lords, and all noble men, and to subvert the weal public of our realm."[1] Consequently the king decided to trust London to beat off her enemies and his, and on Tuesday morning, after dispatching a letter to the city telling of his victory over Margaret and her son, set off for the north.

Edward had not gone far when a messenger came riding after him to tell him that Margaret and her three companions had been found in the house of religion to which they had gone just before the battle and that the proud queen, whose spirit was broken at last, wished him to know that she was "at his commandment." He replied with an order to send Margaret to him, and she overtook him at Coventry, where he stopped (11th - 14th May) to refresh his men and to wait for other troops to join him.[2] But even more welcome than the news of Margaret's capture was that which the Earl of Northumberland brought to Coventry. For the earl came to say that the northern insurgents had laid down their arms on hearing of the battle of Tewkesbury. Several of their leaders, the earl stated, had come to him to beg him to intercede for them with the king, and the city of York, around which the agitation seems to have centred, and other guilty towns had also sent to ask for grace.[3]

Much relieved to find that he was no longer needed in the north, Edward told Northumberland to go home and see that peace was preserved hereafter in that part of the kingdom.[4] Then he spurred his horse towards London.

Before this time the Bastard of Fauconberg had assumed the title of "captain and leader of our liege lord King Henry's people in Kent" and had issued a proclamation in which he claimed that Warwick had appointed him "captain of the navy of England and men of war both by the sea and by land." He had also found an ally in the mayor of Canterbury, Nicholas Faunt, grocer, a man who had enjoyed Warwick's special confidence, and had soon succeeded with Faunt's help in assembling a formidable mob, made up of men who were mostly from Kent and the Cinque Ports but partly from Essex and Surrey,[1] at Sittingbourne. From there, on 8th May, he sent polite letters to the mayor and aldermen and "commonalty" of London asking "courteously" to be permitted to pass through the city and promising that, if the permission were granted, neither "victual nor ware" should be taken without payment. "That I promitte you on mine honour," he wrote, "for he is not within the king's host in my company that breaketh the king's cry but he shall have execution according to his offences."[2]

---

[1] Hist. MSS. Com., Report 12, app. 4, p. 5. The "Arrivall" leads one to suppose that Edward left Tewkesbury with the intention of going at once to London and that he did not hear of the rising in the north until he reached Worcester. But the letter Clarence wrote to Vernon two days after the battle shows that the king was even then planning to go north, and Edward himself wrote to Vernon from Tewkesbury telling him to meet him at Coventry. Hist. MSS. Com., *ut sup.*, pp. 4-5.

[2] Arrivall, 31; Warkworth, 19.

[3] Arrivall, 31-32.

[4] Issue Roll, Easter 11 Edw. IV, 13th July.

A few persons, some because they loved the dead Warwick or the imprisoned Henry, some because they hoped for a chance to "put their hands in rich men's coffers,"[3] were in favour of yielding when the Bastard's letters were received; but not so Earl Rivers, Mayor Stokton, whose health was now restored, and the aldermen. The Bastard asked for an answer by nine o'clock on Friday morning, and the one which was drawn up at the Guildhall on Thursday was as firm as Edward could desire. The mayor and aldermen informed the Bastard that when their sovereign lord, King Edward the Fourth, after his great victory on Easter Day beside Barnet, departed from the city, he charged and commanded them to keep it "safely and surely to his behoof and use" and not to suffer any person making unlawful assemblies of his people to enter it. They also told him, notwithstanding his promises, that they knew that if they let him and his fellowship into the city, "your said fellowship would be of like condition as other of like disposition have been in time past, as by sundry

[1] Hist. MSS. Com., Report 9, app., p. 142; Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 287-288, 299-300. Nicholas Faunt of Canterbury, grocer, had received a pardon from Edward in March, 1470. Pardon Roll 9-10 Edw. IV, m. 8. Three years before he had sold a ship to the king. Issue Roll, Mich. 7 Edw. IV, 31st Oct.

[2] Sharpe, London and the Kingdom, III, 387-388. Cf. London Journal 8, ff. 4b-5.

[3] Arrivall, 34. It was Warkworth's belief that if the Kentishmen "had not brent" the commons of the city would have let them in despite Rivers and the mayor and aldermen.

precedents it appeareth unto us right largely," and that it would not "lie in your power to let your said fellowship from despoilage and robbery." Then they urged him "for that love and service that we aforetime ought unto that noble knight, your father and our good lord, whose steps we would that ye should follow, and for very favour that we have borne and bear unto you for the good disposition and virtue that in time past we have known to be in you," to abandon his purpose. They expressed their astonishment, too, that he, being "a man of so great wisdom and discretion," should delude himself with the belief that the Earl of Warwick was still alive, since they had sure proof that he was dead, "not only by the report of men of great credence both of this city and by other which were with the said Earl of Warwick in the field when he and his brother, Marquis Montagu, were slain, but also by open lying of their bodies in the church of Paul's by the space of two days." Finally, they gave the Bastard news of the defeat and death of Henry's son at Tewkesbury, enclosed a copy of the letter in which Edward had announced his victory to them, and exhorted him to acknowledge Edward as king, as they and all the lords spiritual and temporal had done.[1]

The mayor and aldermen were not the only persons who sent warnings and entreaties to the Bastard, for the Archbishop of Canterbury also, on the advice of the council in London, wrote a letter to him.[2] But the chance that he would repent was slight, and London prepared for the worst. From Baynard's Castle to the Tower the river was guarded by men-at-arms with bombards and other engines of war, while Lord Dudley, constable of the Tower, ordered wine pipes filled with sand and gravel to be placed along the banks to form a barricade, tore down a wall at St. Katharine's, probably to give his guns a clearer range, and kept boatloads of armed men ready to act on a moment's notice. Nor were these preparations thrown away; for on Sunday, 12th May, the Bastard made an attack on London bridge during which a gate recently built at the Southwark end was destroyed, set fire to a number of beerhouses near St. Katharine's, damaged the palace and wharf there, and carried off from a meadow half of a herd of a hundred oxen waiting to be turned into meat for the garrison of the Tower.[3]

[1] Sharpe, III, 388-391. Cf. London Journal 8, ff. 5b-6b.

[2] Issue Roll, Easter 11 Edw. IV, 24th June.

[3] Sharpe, London and the Kingdom, III, 391; Cal. Letter Book L, 98;

In spite of his first successes, the Bastard soon saw that it would be impossible for him to force his way into the city from the east, and he started for Kingston, thinking to cross the river there and then come back and make havoc in Westminster. Divining this intention, Rivers sent several boatloads of men to Kingston,[1] but he was so alarmed by the situation that he also made an attempt to bargain with the Bastard, and in the end the Bastard and Faunt, either because "fair words and promises make fools fain" or because they had commenced to fear that their homeward way would be cut off, turned about and went back to St. George's field. On Tuesday, however, the Bastard renewed his attack. Bringing guns from his ships, he placed them along the river's edge opposite the city, and when he was driven away from that position, he sent a part of his men to set fire to the bridge and others to attack Aldgate and Bishopsgate. But when thirteen tenements on the bridge, as well as the gate of the drawbridge, had been burned and some houses at Aldgate had also been destroyed, the Earl of Essex made a sortie from Bishopsgate at the same moment that Rivers, with four or five hundred picked men, sallied from a postern in the Tower. There must have been a sharp fight, especially at Mile End, as two casks of red wine were afterwards assigned for the refreshment of the citizens who fought there,[2] but ultimately the Bastard had to fall back to the river again, leaving many dead and many prisoners behind him, while many more of his men were drowned as they were attempting to board their boats at Blackhall.

Even after this reverse the Bastard stayed another day in St. George's field, and though during the 16th, 17th, and 18th he began to withdraw his men, a few at a time, he went only as far as Blackheath. But finally fifteen hundred men, sent ahead by Edward, came to London's assistance, and when it was noised abroad that the king himself was coming, Mayor Faunt, whose bravery seems to have been of the same type as Mayor Stokton's, besought the Bastard to hurry away. The Bastard was quite ready to listen to this advice, as he himself had decided that it was time to depart, but he acted upon it in a manner Faunt would hardly have

---

Issue Roll, Easter 11 Edw. IV, 19th May, 12th June; Tellers' Roll, Mich. 11 Edw. IV; Political Poems and Songs, II, 277; Ellis, Original Letters, Series II, Vol. I, 410; Writs of Privy Seal, file 838, no. 3417.

[1] Issue Roll, *ut sup.*

[2] Issue Roll, Easter 11 Edw. IV, 19th May.

chosen. Leaving Faunt and most of his other followers to get out of the scrape into which he had led them as best they could, he stole away to Rochester, with only the soldiers and sailors who had come from Calais, and thence to Sandwich, where his fleet was still waiting. At Sandwich his men immediately deserted him and made their way back to Calais, but though he too might have escaped to that refuge, he preferred to "abide the king's coming" and take his chances at obtaining a pardon from Edward, never a hard person to placate.[1]

When the Bastard's followers found that their leader had deserted them, they took the only course left to them:

> "They vanysshyd away as thayre tayles had be brent."[2]

And immediately after Edward reached London. A deputation of citizens headed by the mayor and aldermen met the king between Islington and Shoreditch, and at once Edward showed his gratitude for the city's loyalty and courage by stopping in the highway to bestow knighthood on Mayor Stokton, the aldermen, and Recorder Urswick.[3] When he entered the city, with trumpets and clarions making triumphal music, the Duke of Gloucester led the procession with the son of the late Earl of Pembroke and other lords; after them came Hastings, and after Hastings the king himself, while farther back were to be seen the Duke of Clarence and, seated in a chariot, Margaret of Anjou.[4]

It was on Tuesday, 21st May, that Edward for the second time within little more than a month returned in triumph to the capital of his kingdom;[5] and on Wednesday Henry VI "from the Tower of London was brought dead through London." The story given out was that Henry, on hearing that his son was dead and his wife a prisoner, took the news "to so great despite, ire, and indignation that of pure displeasure and melancholy he died." But John Warkworth, who wrote what he believed to be true, not what he was told to write, declares that the king "was put to death the 21st day of May, on a Tuesday night, betwixt 11 and 12 of the clock, being then at the Tower the Duke of Gloucester, brother to King Edward, and many other."[1] And certainly Warkworth was by no means the only person who believed that a murder had taken place. Sforza di Bettini, when sending the Duke of Milan the latest news from England, stated that Edward had caused Henry to be secretly assassinated in the Tower; and Philip de Commynes writes that, if what he was told was true, the Duke of Gloucester "killed poor King Henry with his own hand, or else caused him to be killed in his presence in some place apart."[2] In fact, the general belief at the time, official explanations notwithstanding, was that Henry's life was ended by Edward's order and by Gloucester's hand. Apparently his life had been spared until now, not so much because the man who had deprived him of his throne shrank from putting him to death, though Edward, even at his worst, was never bloodthirsty, as because nothing was to be gained, and something might be lost, by his death. Had Henry been put to death while his son lived, every man whose heart was loyal to the house of Lancaster would merely have transferred his allegiance, probably with intensified devotion, to the Prince. But now that the son lay under the pavement of Tewkesbury Abbey, to kill the father was to "crush the seed," as Bettini expressed it, and Henry's doom followed quickly.[3]

---

[1] Arrivall, 34-37; Warkworth, 20; Sharpe, London and the Kingdom, III, 391-392; Cal. Letter Book L, 98; Hist. Croy. Cont., 556; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 184-185; Kingsford, Eng. Hist. Lit. in Fif. Cent., 374-375; Commynes-Dupont, III, 288; Hall, 302.

[2] Political Poems and Songs, II, 277-279.

[3] Urswick was also made chief baron of the Exchequer, and the city voted him a pipe of wine annually. Cal. Patent Rolls, II, 259; Sharpe, I, 317.

[4] Political Poems and Songs, II, 280-281; Arrivall, 38; Sharpe, Cal. Letter Book L, *ut sup.*; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., *ut sup.*; Hist. Croy. Cont., 555-556; Kingsford's London Chron., 184; Kingsford, Eng. Hist. Lit. in Fif. Cent., *ut sup.*; Stow, 425.

[5] This is according to the "Arrivall" and also according to the notes printed by Kingsford, Eng. Hist. Lit. in Fif. Cent., *ut sup.* According to Letter Book L and the Croyland chronicle, however, Edward reached London on the vigil of the Ascension, which would mean 22nd May (not 16th May, as Dr. Sharpe gives it).

In whatever way death came to Henry VI, proper respect was paid to his corpse. Surrounded by torch bearers, the body was carried to St. Paul's where, with face uncovered, it lay upon a bier guarded by soldiers; and though one chronicler remarks that "glaives and staves" were more in evidence than torches, Hugh Bryce, by Edward's order, spent more than fifteen pounds for wax, linen, and spices for the funeral. No amount of pomp and trappings, however, could conceal the wicked deed which had been done, and it was told that King Henry's body "bled on the pavement" both at St. Paul's and afterwards at Blackfriars, where, on 24th May, the final obsequies were performed. From the Blackfriars a barge bore the last of the Lancastrian kings up the Thames to the Lady Chapel of Chertsey Abbey, where a tomb was provided for him and where he was allowed to lie in peace until, by the command of the man whose hand is supposed to have "sticked" him with a dagger, his bones were carried on a second journey up the winding river, past Runnymede Meadow and Magna Charta Island, to find their final resting place at Windsor in the chapel which Edward IV had rebuilded to the honour of St. George and the Order of the Garter and in which that king himself was by that time sleeping the eternal sleep. Long before that second journey, however, Henry VI's former subjects had done more than justice to his memory; for despite all the misery and humiliation that had been England's portion during his reign, he had become in his people's eyes a saint and a martyr whose intercession they besought in their prayers and to whose virtues they believed God testified by many miracles.[1]

---

[1] Kingsford, Eng. Hist. Lit. in Fif. Cent., 370; Arrivall, *ut sup.*; Warkworth, 21. The author of the "Arrivall" would have us believe that Henry did not die until the 23rd, that is, not until after Edward had left the city for Kent. Yet the date officially adopted for the king's death was 22nd May. See Alien Subsidies, bundle 236, nos. 124, 128, 129.

[2] Cal. Milanese Papers, I, 157; Commynes, I, 219. Basin (I, 159) understood that Henry was strangled, while Fabyan says he was "sticked with a dagger" by Gloucester. It was reported in France, we learn from Bettini, that Margaret too had been put to death.

[3] Cf. Stubbs, III, 217.

---

[1] Warkworth, *ut sup.*; Fabyan, 662; Kingsford's London Chron., 185; Hist. Croy. Cont., 556; Arrivall, 38; Three Fif. Cent. Chron., 184; Issue Roll, Easter 11 Edw. IV, 24th June (Rymer, XI, 712-713); Stow, 424. Henry's "red hat of velvet," says Stow, "was thought to heal the headache of such as put it on their heads." For a prayer in verse addressed to the king, see Trevelyan Papers (Camden Society), Pt. I, 59-60. Henry VII began negotiations for the canonization of Henry VI.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
AT THE BOWERING PRESS,
GEORGE STREET, PLYMOUTH

410

212

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

UTL AT DOWNSVIEW
D RANGE BAY SHLF POS ITEM C
39 07 03 22 05 006 1